

AN ANALYSIS OF THE DECLARED AND UNDECLARED REASONS FOR THE SECOND GULF WAR

Angelika Karolina Milewski

Mini-dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree
Master of Security Studies (MSS) in the Department of Political Sciences,
Faculty of Humanities, University of Pretoria

September 2011

Study Leader: Prof M Hough

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to convey my sincere thanks and appreciation to my study leader, Prof. M. Hough, who provided continuous guidance and expert knowledge throughout this research.

I would also like to thank Ms Martin who served as an important link between me and Prof. Hough.

I would like to thank Mr Botes for assisting me in editing the dissertation. I would also like to thank Ms Pretorius and Mr Bradley who assisted me in conveying the transcripts of my dissertation for evaluation whilst I was abroad as well as Ms Dos Santos who motivated me to complete my dissertation with speed.

I would like to dedicate this study to my parents, Danushka and Peter Milewski, who taught me that education is the most important objective in life, and that through educational achievement, I would be prepared to master any opportunity in life.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE DECLARED AND UNDECLARED REASONS FOR THE SECOND GULF WAR

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE NUMBER
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
1. IDENTIFICATION OF THE RESEARCH THEME	1
2. LITERATURE SURVEY	2
3. IDENTIFICATION AND DEMARCATION OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM	3
4. METHODOLOGY	4
5. STRUCTURE OF THE RESEARCH	5
CHAPTER TWO: THE CAUSES OF, AND REASONS FOR WAR: A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	7
1. INTRODUCTION	7
2. THE CONCEPT OF WAR	9
2.1. Definition of War	9
2.2. Types of War	11
2.2.1. Interstate and Intrastate Wars	11
2.2.2. Total and Limited Wars	12
2.2.3. Conventional and Unconventional Wars	13
3. THE CAUSES OF WAR	13
3.1. Distinctions of the Causes of War	14
3.1.1. Immediate and Underlying Causes	14
3.1.2. Efficient and Permissive Causes	15
3.1.3. Necessary and Sufficient Causes	15

3.1.4. Aggravating Conditions for War	16
3.2. The Underlying Causes of Interstate War	17
3.2.1. Human Nature as an Underlying Cause	18
3.2.2. The Nation State System	20
3.2.3. The International System	22
3.2.4. The Contribution of Realism to Understanding War Causation	25
4. MOTIVES AND REASONS FOR WAR	27
4.1. Conscious and Unconscious Motives for War	27
4.2. Reasons for War	28
4.2.1. Material Interests	30
4.2.1.1. Natural and Industrial Resources	30
4.2.1.2. Security, Post-Industrial Resources and Arms Race	32
4.2.1.3. Poverty	33
4.2.2. Social Reasons for War	34
4.2.2.1. Domestic Structure of a State and Democracies	35
4.2.2.2. Ethnicity	35
4.2.3. Cultural Reasons for War	36
5. CONCLUSION	38

CHAPTER THREE: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO THE FIRST GULF WAR:

1990 – 1991 42

1. INTRODUCTION	42
2. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF GULF OIL	43
3. THE BEGINNING OF IRAQ’S REGIONAL AMBITIONS	45
3.1. Iraq’s Invasion of Iran (1980)	45
3.2. Iraq’s Invasion of Kuwait	46
3.2.1. Iraq’s Political and Economic Predicament	47
3.2.2. Territorial Dispute Between Iraq and Kuwait	47
3.2.3. Allegations of Illegal Extraction of Oil by Kuwait	48
3.2.4. Kuwait’s Intention to Raise its Oil Production Quota	48
4. THE INVASION OF IRAQ:1991	49
4.1. Background to the 1991 Gulf War	49

4.2. The Declared and Undeclared Reasons for the US Intervention in the 1991 Gulf War	52
4.2.1. The Declared Reasons for the 1991 Gulf War	53
4.2.1.1. The Liberation of Kuwait and Containing Iraq's Regional Ambitions	53
4.2.1.2. Iraq's Nuclear, Chemical and Biological Weapons Programme	55
4.2.2. The Undeclared Reasons for the 1991 Gulf War	57
4.2.2.1. Securing Oil and Maintaining the Stability and Price of Oil	57
4.2.2.2. Preventing an Iraqi Threat to Israel's Regional Power	59
5. CONCLUSION	61
CHAPTER FOUR: THE DECLARED REASONS FOR THE SECOND GULF WAR	63
1. INTRODUCTION	63
2. US POLICY BACKGROUND PRIOR TO THE SECOND GULF WAR	64
2.1. The 11 September 2001 Terrorist Attacks	65
2.2. The 2002 US National Security Strategy	67
3. THE OFFICIAL DECLARED REASONS FOR THE IRAQ WAR AND INTELLIGENCE FAILURES	68
3.1. Iraq's Alleged Weapons of Mass Destruction	68
3.1.1. Building the Case for the War: Iraq's Alleged WMD	68
3.1.1.1. Official Statements	71
3.1.1.2. Analysis	73
3.1.2. Intelligence Failures Regarding Iraq's Alleged WMD	74
3.2. Iraq's Alleged Links to Al Qaeda and Intelligence Failures	76
3.2.1. Iraq's Alleged Links to Al Qaeda and Terrorism	77
3.2.1.1. Official Statements	77
3.2.1.2. Analysis	78
3.2.2. Intelligence Failures Regarding Iraq's Alleged Links to Al Qaeda	80
3.3. The Promotion of Democracy in Iraq	81
3.3.1. Official Statements	81
3.3.2. Analysis	83
4. CONCLUSION	85

CHAPTER FIVE: THE UNDECLARED REASONS FOR THE SECOND GULF WAR 87

1. INTRODUCTION	87
2. STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE OF THE MIDDLE EAST REGION AND IRAQ	88
2.1. Strategic Value of the Middle East as a Source of Petroleum	89
2.2. Iraq's Petroleum Potential and Industry	92
2.3. Iraq's Oil Industry Since the 2003 US War with Iraq	93
3. ANALYSIS OF THE ALLEGED UNDECLARED REASONS	95
3.1. The Geo-strategic Importance of Iraq and the US Economic Reform Initiatives	96
3.2. The Alleged US Interest in Securing Iraqi Oil	99
3.2.1. US Aims to Regain Dominance in Iraq Oil Production	101
3.2.2. Preventing Competition from Rival Multinational Companies	104
3.2.3. Preventing the Pricing of Oil in the Euro Currency	106
3.2.4. Peak Oil and the US Need to Secure Adequate Oil Reserves	107
3.3. Securing US Hegemony and US Dominance in the Region	108
3.4. Serving the Interests of the US Military-Industrial Complex	109
3.5. Preventing a Regional Threat to Israel	111
4. CONCLUSION	113

CHAPTER SIX: EVALUATION 115

1. INTRODUCTION	115
2. SUMMARY OF THE TEXT	115
3. TESTING OF THE ASSUMPTIONS OF THE DISSERTATION	117
3.1. Assumption: Both the Declared and the Alleged Undeclared Reasons for the War Were Important in the US Decision to Go to War with Iraq in 2003.	118
3.1.1. The Importance of the Declared Reasons for the War	118
3.1.2. The Importance of the Undeclared Reasons for the War	120
3.2. Assumption: The Declared Reasons of Iraq's Alleged WMD and its Alleged Link to Al Qaeda Were Not Credible and Iraq Did Not Pose an Immediate Threat to the US and its Allies.	122
3.3. Assumption: The First Gulf War and the 11 September 2001 Terrorist Attacks	

in the US Provided a Context for the 2003 Gulf War.	124
4. CONCLUSION	125
ABSTRACT	131
BIBLIOGRAPHY	133
ANNEXURES	
Annex I: Acronyms and Abbreviations	159
LIST OF TABLES	
Table I: The Importance and Credibility of the Declared Reasons	126
Table II: The Importance and Credibility of the Alleged Undeclared Reasons	126
Table III: Correlation of the Declared and the Alleged Undeclared Reasons to the General Causes, Motives and Reasons for War	129

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1. IDENTIFICATION OF THE RESEARCH THEME

The research theme draws from the United States (US) led war on Iraq launched on 19 March 2003 and what motivated the US to launch the campaign. Although a variety of possible factors may have motivated the US administration to invade the country, it has been argued that the principal factor may have been the desire by the US to gain control of Iraq's oil reserves. This notwithstanding, the US, supported by the United Kingdom (UK), first argued that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and that its regime had ambitions to strengthen its alleged nuclear capabilities. During the time of the invasion, various unconfirmed sources alluded to overt and implicit factors that may have led to the war. Some critics argued that the US went to war to inspire democratisation in Iraq, whilst others argued that the war was fought in order to oust former President Saddam Hussein. The argument that Iraq possessed WMD and that it posed a threat to the US later proved to be unsubstantiated, yet the US carried out the invasion and ever since, terrorism, insurgency and sectarian conflict have continued in Iraq.

After the war began in 2003, the world expected that stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons would be found and that hidden laboratories would be uncovered in Iraq. This however, was not the case and as a result, the justification for the war was questioned. Moreover, the US-led alliance started to present other reasons for the war. The US Administration began putting a case forward that the invasion was also part of a strategy to eliminate and fight international terrorism and that the war was necessary for US homeland defence (Blix, 2005: 12). Moreover, the US Administration also claimed that the war was waged for humanitarian purposes and as a means of promoting democracy in Iraq as well as the Middle East region. Apart from these declared reasons, there may have also been other undisclosed reasons, causes or motives for the war, such as the alleged US oil interests in Iraq and the Middle East region; promoting US hegemony in the region; the alleged US corporate interests, as well as the alleged role that Israel

may have played in influencing the US to invade Iraq. In keeping with the above, the main objectives of the research are to analyse the various declared and alleged undeclared reasons or motives that led to the invasion. The sub-objectives are to identify the relative importance of each of these; to establish the credibility of the main declared reasons, and to assess the effect of the First Gulf War on the outbreak of the Second Gulf War.

2. LITERATURE SURVEY

Sources which discuss the Iraq war and make references to the declared and alleged undeclared reasons for the war include Ali 2003, Venter 2004, Hallenberg & Karlsson 2004 and Abrams & Gungwu 2003. Although these sources provide an overall analysis of the war and how it was fought, they do not significantly delve into the declared and alleged undeclared reasons for the war. However, there is an abundance of research conducted on the declared reason of Iraq's alleged WMD, which include Blix 2004, Iraq Survey Group 2004, Cirincione *et al* 2004, and Dillon 2002, whereas Bresheeth & Davis 1991, Sciolino 1991, and Tripp 2002, explore Iraq's WMD related programmes from the early 1980s up to the period following the end of the 1991 Gulf War. Pollack (2002) provides interesting insight as to why the US may have perceived a long term threat from Iraq to its national security interests. There are numerous sources that suggest a link between the 2003 Iraq war and the alleged US interest in Iraqi oil namely Paul 2003, Clark 2003, Hinnebusch 2007, Foster 2008, and Hooshiyar & Karimi, 2005. Other available sources such as Cordesman 2004, and Cordesman & Rodhan 2006, discuss the energy potential of the Middle East, especially that of Iraq, and implicitly suggest that oil interests may have formed part of the reason for the invasion. The International Energy Agency (IEA) 2002, and the US Department of Energy, Energy Information Agency (DoE) 2001 & 2002, also attest to the energy potential of the region as well as Iraq.

There are some studies that provide in-depth analyses of other reasons such as the promotion of democracy in the Middle East, the influence of Israel, neo-liberalism, the preservation of US hegemony, the global war on terrorism, the attacks of September 9/11 as well as Al Qaeda, which include, Carothers & Ottaway 2005, Rabasa 2004, Brunn 2004, Singer 2004, Rabasa 2006a & 2006b, as well as Todorov 2005. These sources in general provide some analysis of the

declared and alleged undeclared reasons but they do not explore them substantially and they therefore provide a limited background in terms of defining each of the factors. Official statements and speeches made by former US President George Bush (2002 & 2003) and former British Prime Minister Tony Blair as well as by the former Director of the US Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), George Tenet (US CIA, 2004), only provide the official position or the declared reasons for the war. Other official sources such as the recommendations and findings of the US Presidential Commission on the Intelligence Capabilities of the United States Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction (2005) as well as by the United Kingdom Intelligence and Security Committee on Iraqi WMD (2003), provide good insight into the intelligence conducted by the US intelligence community regarding Iraq especially with regard to the claims concerning Iraq's alleged WMD.

This study therefore intends to fill some of the voids in existing research by focusing on a distinction between the declared reasons and the alleged undeclared reasons or underlying motives. The research will identify which factor/s was/were the actual main reason/s for the war and which other factor/s played a more minor part.

3. IDENTIFICATION AND DEMARCATION OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

The main research question to be answered is which undeclared reasons in addition to the declared reasons seemed to have played a role in the US decision to invade Iraq?

The first sub-question to be answered is what is the relative importance of the declared reasons and the alleged undeclared reasons for the war and why were the declared reasons continuously changing?

The second sub-question is whether Iraq's alleged WMD and its perceived links with Al Qaeda were indeed the main reasons that led to the war and whether Iraq actually posed a threat to the US and its allies?

The third sub-question to be answered is whether the First US-led Gulf War in 1991 against Iraq, and the attacks on the US that occurred on 11 September 2001 provided a context for the Second Gulf War?

In view of the research problems formulated above, a number of assumptions can be formulated namely that both the declared and the alleged undeclared reasons for the war were important in the US decision to go to war with Iraq in 2003; the declared reasons of Iraq's alleged WMD and its alleged link to Al Qaeda were not credible and Iraq did not pose a threat to the US and its allies, and the First Gulf War and the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks in the US provided a context for the 2003 Gulf War.

In terms of the time frame of the study, events leading to the First Gulf War (such as Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990) will be discussed to illustrate why Iraq and its alleged WMD were considered by the US and the UK specifically as threats to international peace and security. The period between 2002 and March 2003 will be analysed with regard to the Second Gulf War as well as the period after the March 2003 invasion up to the end of 2008, to illustrate US involvement in the reconstruction of the political and economic system in Iraq and continuing US interests in Iraq.

4. METHODOLOGY

The research is descriptive and analytical and firstly explores existing theories of the causes of war in general, which explain the use of force as a response to different security and power goals, economic interests, liberal idealist aims and domestic political interests. Mainly realist theories will be explored in an attempt to explain the relevance of security in international relations as well as how and why power and security are the ultimate objectives of states. Realist theories may provide some understanding of why the US seems to be primarily concerned with military and security issues (Meernik, 2004: 20).

The causes of war may also be attributed to advancing the goals associated with liberal idealism, which in this research refers to the promotion of democracy and human rights in Iraq. Since democracies normally do not wage war with each other, this theory may explain why the US

may have been motivated to promote democracy in Iraq and in the Middle East region, since the growth of democracy in a previously autocratic country (such as Iraq) could decrease potential threats to US national interests in the region. The US has advocated the promotion of democracy since it entered World War I and it has previously exported American ideals abroad. It has also been argued that the US imperative for the Middle East over the years has seemingly been driven by its own security concerns (Muravchik, 1992: 12). Therefore, the 2003 Iraq war could be perceived to have been instrumental for the US to establish conditions in Iraq conducive to the growth of democracy which would minimise threats to the US in the future.

Both primary and secondary sources are used in the research. In terms of the theoretical framework on the causes of war, the sources consulted include Brown, The Causes and Prevention of War. 1994; Dannreuther, International Security: The Contemporary Agenda. 2007; Nelson. & Olin, Why War? Ideology, Theory and History. 1979; Suganami, On the Causes of War. 1996, and Vertzberger, Risk Taking and Decision Making. 1998. These sources provide a background and explanation of the realist theory surrounding war and the causes of war, as well as explaining the conditions that must exist for wars to occur. Brown (1994) not only discusses the causes of war but also discusses strategies for the prevention and control of war.

Dannreuther (2007) provides a good overview of the changing nature and conditions of international security after the Cold War as well as explaining the shifting dynamics in the international security field. Furthermore, he discusses the implications for international security of the struggle and competition over resources and oil as well as the implications of the aftermath of the 11 September 2001 terror attacks, and how WMD have come to dominate the global agenda.

5. STRUCTURE OF THE RESEARCH

The research is structured as follows:

Chapter One: Introduction

Chapter one provides the research objectives, research questions and methodology

Chapter Two: The Causes of, and Reasons for War: A Conceptual Framework

Chapter two explores theories which explain the general causes of and reasons for war and military intervention, including security and power goals and economic interests. The focus is specifically on interstate wars.

Chapter Three: Historical Background to the First Gulf War, 1990 - 1991

Chapter three briefly examines why the First Gulf War was fought, including why Iraq and its WMD programme were perceived as a threat to the region as well as US interests. The chapter provides a brief description of the events leading to the First Gulf War in 1991 after Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990, and the events that eventually culminated in the decision to invade Iraq in 2003 (the Second Gulf War). This chapter broadly identifies those objectives which were not attained during the First Gulf War and how these may have influenced the US decision to invade Iraq in 2003.

Chapter Four: Declared Reasons for the Second Gulf War

Chapter four discusses the decision made by the US to invade Iraq especially within the context of the terror attacks of 11 September 2001 as well as the “war on terrorism”. It also discusses the declared reasons for the war as well as the credibility of the declared reasons, and briefly examines the nature of intelligence reports prior to the war.

Chapter Five: The Undeclared Reasons for the Second Gulf War

Chapter five discusses the undeclared reasons which include securing oil resources in Iraq and the region; promoting American corporate interests; preventing the pricing of oil in the euro currency; maintaining US hegemony; promoting the interests of the US military-industrial complex, and protecting Israel's position in the region;

Chapter Six: Evaluation

Chapter six provides an evaluation of the assumptions formulated in the Introduction.

CHAPTER TWO

THE CAUSES OF, AND REASONS FOR WAR: A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

1. INTRODUCTION

International relations is concerned with the promotion of peace as well as the conduct of war, which remains a constant feature of international politics. Wars between states have become much less common, but cannot be discounted especially if there is a conflict of interest which threatens the national security interests of a state. The recent invasion of Iraq in 2003 illustrates that conflict between states is possible, irrespective of whether the threat is exaggerated or not. The national inclination by a state to go to war is usually influenced by the geo-political situation of the country, the competition for security and economic well-being as well as a state's capacity to achieve its aims through either peaceful or violent means. The anarchic international system has conditioned a persisting culture of war in that the system legitimises a state to promote and protect its national interests, and as such, states are relatively unconstrained in the promotion and protection of such national interests (Brown, 1994: 101). Despite the absence of the threat of large scale warfare between the great powers, war and conflict remain a feature of the international system due to various underlying reasons and direct causes which may propel societies and nations to resort to war and conflict.

Developments in technology and changes in the economic and political landscape have altered the characteristics and form of war. As a result, the causes and reasons of civil war and insurgencies differ from those characterising traditional great power rivalry. Most literature has focused on identifying causes of major wars due to the preoccupation of great power wars during the twentieth century. Since the state is viewed as the sole form of political community capable to employ force, explanations of causes of low intensity conflicts and civil wars by other non-state actors have previously been left out of the mainstream agenda. Realist thinking as well as individual and interpretive contributions to International Relations theory have dominated

debates about the causes and reasons of war, and these studies have focused on explaining war causation from a scientific perspective, which identifies causal bases that are knowledgeable and predictable (Beier, 2008: 84, 88). Each war, although unique, has underlying causes, namely human nature, misperception, the nature of states and the structure of the international system, which enable war to occur (Garnett, 2007: 20). Causes of war can be categorized into underlying and immediate causes, conscious and unconscious motives, efficient and permissive causes, necessary and sufficient causes as well as aggravating conditions and trigger causes. There are also reasons for war and these may include country specific issues which may provoke states to go to war. Due to competing views of the international system, there is little agreement as to the identity of causes of war, methodology of discovering causes and the conceptual framework by which various causes can be grouped into a coherent explanation (Beier, 2008: 82). Historical comparisons offer significant potential to understand the concept of war, but they mostly explain war as a separate and unique event (from a descriptive and idiographic approach) and disregard the fact that the occurrence and the process of war follow discernible historical patterns from which several common causes of war can be identified (Garnett, 2007: 20). Social scientists have aimed to identify determinants of war and those circumstances and conditions which make war likely through correlating several historic wars to enable an extrapolation of trends and tendencies. This enables various conclusions to be drawn as to the possible causes and reasons of war (Beier, 2008: 80).

To understand the recurring patterns of international conflict, it is necessary to explore various theories about the causes of war to develop an integrated approach to the study on war causation. Nelson and Olin, (1979), explored various theories of war, which include the conservative and liberal theory of war, and each theory is rooted in various assumptions about human nature and society (Nelson & Olin, 1979: 1, 3). There is a close relationship between theory and ideology since theories may often derive from ideologies and may be conditioned by various assumptions, beliefs and ideas about how the international system functions. As defined by Nelson and Olin, (1979: 6, 7), a theory is based on an explanation of several historical events from which a number of similarities were tested and proven. Therefore, for the purpose of identifying various causes of war, several theories will be explored. Theories about war have incorporated three common questions namely: what are the conditions which must be present for wars to occur;

under what sort of circumstances have wars occurred more frequently, and how did this particular war come about? In respect of the first two questions, the theory of Kenneth Waltz “Man, the State and War” will be explored in a later section in this chapter. The last question will be answered by identifying and exploring reasons for war. The following section will briefly define the concept of war and identify the types of war before exploring the different causes of war and the associated theories.

2. THE CONCEPT OF WAR

This section will define the concept of war and the purpose that it serves as well as discuss the types of war, which include interstate and intrastate wars, total and limited wars and conventional and unconventional wars. The various types of wars may be fought for specific and particular reasons and each war would be fought in a different context. Moreover, the underlying causes of interstate war would not necessarily be the same for intrastate wars.

2.1. Definition of War

According to Von Clausewitz, as quoted by Sheehan (2007: 47), “war is essentially a political activity and not merely an act of policy, but a true political instrument, a continuation of political intercourse, carried out by other means”. War is a purposeful activity and its rationale and logic is defined in terms of its political instrumentality. Clausewitz recognised that war was employed by sovereign states to attain various political objectives, that it depended on the willingness to inflict violence and to suffer casualties and that its basic purpose was to seek battle and to impose one’s will on the opponent through violence to achieve an end (Sheehan, 2007: 47). Therefore war is the means through which states seek to resolve international disputes and an outcome of their willingness to employ military force to defend and protect their foreign policies as typified by the two World Wars of the Twentieth Century. In the post-Cold War period, the use of military force is driven by less predictable threats such as poverty, ethnicity, religion and competition for scarce resources whereby terrorism, insurgencies and civil wars have been a response to political units by non-state actors (Sheehan, 2008: 212).

According to Griffith (1977: 40), Sun Tzu defined war as a grave concern of the state, which should be preceded by measures designed to enable a state to win the war. He saw war as an art rather as science due to its various complexities and variables which do not often repeat themselves to enable prediction. He differentiated between national strategy and military strategy and emphasised three matters, human, physical and doctrinal, which must be taken into account and assessed when planning a war.

Much of Clausewitz's theories about war remained of relevance throughout the period of industrialised mass warfare, and into the age of nuclear weapons and limited war. According to Clausewitz, an effective and deliberate strategy to conduct and to achieve the political ends of a war is critical to create advantages for the attacker on the battlefield and to win the war. This still applies to modern warfare (Mahnken, 2007: 67, 68). During war planning, states develop strategies based on clearly identified and articulated political goals, assess comparative advantage relative to the adversary, calculate costs and benefits, and examine the risks and benefits of alternative strategies. Decision makers develop sound and effective strategies when they have a good understanding of war, the national interests at stake, the costs and risks involved as well as the political ends that are to be attained. But in general, there is no pattern which can predict war or a single reliable strategy to ensure its success (Cohen, 2007: 142).

War can be considered a "continuation of a state's foreign policy", and in order to identify the causes of war, the particular articulation of a state's national interests or the interests of a rebel group or insurgency should be examined (Beier, 2008: 86). Therefore, in line with this argument, national interests will be briefly discussed in the following sections and how critical national interests may influence a state's decision to go to war.

Over and above, war is a highly organised activity used to achieve higher political ends and to realise the national interests of a state. The act of war demands that there are two or more parties with opposing interests to wage the war and that it should be fought by employing military instruments or weapons that have the ability to create political and economic destruction of the target state. Its intensity can accelerate change, transform industry, society and government as well as force internal reforms, social change and political modernisation in the target state. War

can be differentiated from other forms of violence such as criminal or communal violence and the main distinguishing factor is that war is used in a political context. Unlike communal violence, international law exists to regulate the use of violence during wartime, implying a legal relationship between political entities on their engagement during wartime (Sheehan, 2008: 216). The next section will briefly distinguish between the different types of war.

2.2. Types of War

Post-modernity and the process of globalisation in the international system has inspired changes in the forms and types of war and warfare. Having defined war in the preceding section, warfare is a reflection of the era in which it occurs, taking into account various transformations in the political, social, military, intellectual and economic domain (Sheehan, 2007: 48). It also encompasses the various technologies, techniques and organisational forms of war-fighting, use of computers, use of satellite communication systems, stealth weapons and other guided munitions (Latham, 1999: 210, 212). Warfare denotes revolutions that took place in terms of military innovations that have transformed instruments, ideas and institutions of war. Hence war-fighting would be different from wars fought in previous decades. Whereas the Twentieth Century was characterised mostly by interstate wars, limited and total war and the threat of nuclear war, the international system is now largely characterised by intrastate, regional wars, civil wars, insurgencies and terrorism. Each age and century had its own dominant form of war which reflected the features and developments of that era. War is nevertheless a form of human behavior driven by various circumstances in individual political and cultural environments (Sheehan, 2008: 213). Traditional wars have largely been played out in the international context whereas contemporary war features in the local context and is influenced by globalisation and inter-and non-governmental organisations. This section will distinguish between intrastate and interstate wars, limited and total war and conventional and unconventional wars.

2.2.1. Interstate and Intrastate Wars

Interstate wars refer to wars or armed conflict between two or more state systems fought by uniformed soldiers employing air, naval and ground power. This type has become less common

but its occurrence is possible if there is a conflict of interest which threatens the national security interests of one state. In the post-Cold War period, wars have taken distinctive forms reflective of social, cultural, economic and political changes in the international environment. Intrastate wars (conflict and violence within a state) are fought by militias, paramilitaries, warlord armies, gangs and tribal groups and participants also include women and children (Sheehan, 2008: 213). Intrastate conflicts often occur in Third World countries as a result of the disintegration of states, struggles for political control of the state by opposing forces, deteriorating socio-economic conditions, competition over land and resources, corruption and the struggle for culture, identity and self-determination (Sheehan, 2008: 222). Intrastate wars are usually small-scale and indiscriminate and result in high levels of casualties especially since lightly armed combatants do not conform to the international rules of war. Intrastate conflicts do not always result in the full mobilisation of the military, but they can lead to the deterioration of the humanitarian situation, large scale infrastructural and economic devastation, political and cultural divisions within society, as well as spill over effects for neighboring countries. Intrastate conflict may also be fuelled by the support provided by one government to a particular rebel group through providing funding or weapons to fight the war (De Jonge Oudraat, 2004: 151).

2.2.2. Total and Limited Wars

Total war implies the complete mobilisation of a country's human, economic and military resources as well as the targeting of civilians, economic and industrial base and government installations of the target. In total war, war is nationalised to involve all aspects of the state system in the preparation and conduct of war (Sheehan, 2008: 221). A state could resort to total war if its sovereignty and its vital national interests were under serious threat and the state's objectives would be to totally destroy and paralyze the target. In limited war, a state will use restraint with respect to the objectives, geographic theatre, duration, selection of targets and the types of weapons used. The objectives in a limited war such as the 1990-91 Gulf War, would be to attain a specific goal such as a piece of territory, natural resources or to reprimand the target for a specific violation (Snyder & Malik, 1999: 195). World War II could be considered a total war since conflict occurred nearly on every continent and involved many countries.

2.2.3. Conventional and Unconventional Wars

Unconventional war can be considered to be low intensity conflict or limited war which includes some forms of civil war, guerilla warfare, counterinsurgency wars, proxy wars, and revolutionary wars. Unconventional war can be defined as a form of warfare wherein conventional military tactics, formations and weapons are not used. Conventional war is dependant upon the infantry, armed forces and weapons technology to be employed during the battle and incorporates military doctrine, strategy, command and tactics, training, morale, and leadership, all important factors in a country's war fighting capacity (Mahnken, 2007: 68). As opposed to conventional war, which is characterised by uniformed soldiers and formations, unconventional war is more disorderly and is not fought on the traditional battlefield. Unconventional wars are fought by those without the technology to fight a conventional war and often occur in failed states between different factions (Snyder & Malik, 1999: 200). Unconventional war may also include plunder and theft, hostage taking, extortion, drug and arms trafficking and money laundering (Mahnken, 2007: 63).

The next section will define what the cause of war implies and describe various causes of war such as those inherent in human nature and the international system, as identified in several theories mentioned in the Introduction. The general theories as discussed below can be applied to the types of war described above but more specifically to interstate war which can be total or limited and conventional in nature.

3. THE CAUSES OF WAR

War is still considered an instrument of change, primarily used to protect the national interests of a nation state, to impose the will of a state on another and to force the target to make a foreign policy change. Due to its destructiveness, abolishing war has become a priority but to prevent it, the causes of war and reasons for war (discussed in the next section) need to be addressed (Garnett, 2007: 20). Causes of war can be considered as the necessary and sufficient conditions that precede war and conditions that are always present but do not always lead to war. Such causes are inherent in the international system, the nation state and human nature (Ziegler, 1990: 131). Moreover, causes of war are general in nature and may allow war to occur. But irrespective

of the common causes of war, each war is unique and attributed to different circumstances and reasons (Suganami, 1996: 2, 3). Despite the fact that the end of the Cold War brought changes to the international environment; introduced new types of issues and threats; encouraged various material and ideational shifts, and meant a decline in the threat of great power rivalry, the international agenda is still characterised by high policy issues of peace, war and domination in as much as it is occupied with low policy concerns of trade, welfare and economics. But even in the absence of a threat of war on a global scale, the problems of, and causes of war, are critical to foreign policy decision makers, since the different causes (as well as reasons) will lead to different policy recommendations (Dannreuther, 2007: 15). The fundamental task in identifying the causes of war would be to understand the type of wars that occur as well as to distinguish between underlying causes and short term factors that propel states to go to war. Moreover, it is necessary to distinguish causes that are always present from those that contribute to the origins of war, such as aggravating conditions and trigger causes. The next section briefly provides an overview of how causes may be categorised.

3.1. Distinctions of the Causes of War

Studies have identified several distinctions of the causes of war, such as immediate and underlying causes, efficient and permissive causes and necessary and sufficient causes of war (Garnett, 2007: 23). Since these terms have been employed by several theorists and are used throughout this chapter, they are briefly explained below.

3.1.1. Immediate and Underlying Causes

Immediate causes refer to situations which could be trivial or accidental events that eventually trigger a war. This explanation focuses on international events rather than on the foreign policies pursued by nation states. Therefore leaders may not always be involved and in control of such events, but as they occur, they may be forced into a situation of war. Underlying causes refer to those structural elements in the international system such as the absence of a mechanism to prevent war, that allow war to occur but do not necessarily cause war.

In keeping with the above, Rummel (1979) defined trigger causes of war and these include incidents or actions that provoke the will of a state to go to war, disrupting an incongruent structure of expectations. Events such as these will usually manifest as an opportunity, threat or injustice. An opportunity would display a weakness of another state whilst a threat could manifest itself through an assassination plot by another state or the discovery of overt military activities. An injustice could be perceived as a refusal by a state to concede part of its territory to the other state. Some triggers occur suddenly and cannot be ignored by states such as the discovery that a state may be harboring terrorists.

3.1.2. Efficient and Permissive Causes

Efficient causes are connected to the particular circumstances surrounding individual wars and war may therefore result due to certain ambitions and objectives of a nation state, such as the Gulf War between Iraq and Iran due to the desire by former dictator Saddam Hussein to regain a waterway from Iran. Permissive causes are features that exist in the international system, that do not promote war but allow it to occur. Reference is made here to the system of international anarchy and the absence of an authoritative structure to prevent war which implies that states are unrestrained and can still act in a manner that suits their interests (Garnett, 2007: 26). Theorists often equate permissive causes to underlying causes.

3.1.3. Necessary and Sufficient Causes

A necessary condition must be present for war to occur, therefore war cannot occur if this condition does not exist such as the existence of arms since war cannot be fought without weapons. Other conditions include the absence of a mechanism to prevent war and the organisation of human beings into collectives such as states, tribes, ethnic groups or factions. Therefore war would not occur if states had common interests and if there was an effective world government to prevent wars. Theorists treat a “necessary cause” as equivalent to a “permissive cause”. A sufficient cause of war is a condition that if it is present, it guarantees the occurrence of war since war could not occur without its presence such as hatred and intense hostility

between two states. A cause of war can be necessary without being sufficient while a sufficient cause can instigate war without being necessary (Garnett, 2007: 27).

According to Rummel (1979), incongruent expectations of states, the disruption of expectations and a non-libertarian party to the conflict can be considered necessary and sufficient causes of war. Without incongruency between states or disruption in expectations, there would be no war. Moreover, he argues that opposing national interests and capabilities are necessary to the latent conflict. Other necessary causes include a will to engage in conflict, socio-cultural distances, expectations to disrupt the status quo in a state's favour as well as a significant change in the balance of powers wherein a change in the interests, capabilities and will of one state would likely cause another state to perceive an inconsistency in power and that this should be altered to its advantage.

3.1.4. Aggravating Conditions for War

According to Rummel (1979), aggravating conditions worsen latent conflict, which could escalate into war. Socio-cultural dissimilarity makes opposing interests more likely and hampers communication between states and cognitive imbalances between states could lead to misperception and lead to conflict. He also asserts that status difference between states can interject status considerations in conflict. Other aggravating conditions include the coercive power of states as the more power a state has, the more concerned it will be to maintain such power and therefore could resort to war. Therefore the reputation for power, honor and credibility could also provoke a state to go to war in order to defend its self esteem. In terms of intrastate conflict, aggravating conditions may include big power intervention which can transform a local conflict to involve several powers and therefore weaken the local status quo power which is then unable to maintain control over the status quo and domestic resources.

Having defined the above concepts, the following section will discuss the underlying causes of interstate war specifically, whereas the unconscious and conscious motives for war, and reasons for and other specific factors that provoke states to go to war, will be discussed in a later section. In discussing the causes and reasons for war, theories by Waltz in the "Man, the State and War"

(1959) and Nelson and Olin "Why War?" (1979) will be incorporated into the discussion, where these have incorporated the above mentioned concepts. These theories will provide clarity on how the nation state functions as an independent entity in the anarchic international system. It is a complex and difficult task to establish the causes of wars, but it is possible to provide a picture of the various conditions that should be present (Garnett, 2007: 23).

3.2. The Underlying Causes of Interstate War

Various theories, such as realism, conservatism and liberalism, have explained the causes of war based on the structural characteristics of the international system as well as conditions that are present in the system which makes war a possibility. This section will explore the realist, liberal and conservative view on the causes of war and each theory will be incorporated into the discussion on human nature, the nation state system and the international system. However, attention will primarily be devoted to the realist view since the theory covers the causes and conditions for war in depth.

Realists view the international system from a pessimistic standpoint and believe that governments have chaotic and selfish tendencies which cannot be suppressed since there is no centralised legal order to bind and restrain all states from resorting to violent and forceful military action. One of the central theories of realism is that states have engaged and are constantly engaging in a struggle for power and security (immediate aim) in the international system, therefore resulting in imbalances in power amongst individual states (Nelson & Olin, 1979: 29). Realism also emphasises the sovereignty of states and how power and interest guide state policy and how the balance of power determines the extent to which an individual state's policy is realised. Garnett (1992: 65) points out that realists highlight the limitations of international law, emphasise the disintegrating anarchic forces in the international system and question the relevance of ideas of world government, collective disarmament and collective security. Therefore realist theory views the international system as anarchic in light of the absence of an effective anti-war device and a continuously unstable international situation where war is a possibility if the interests of the nation state are threatened (Suganami, 1997: 63).

States are considered competitive entities, which rely on their own capabilities to protect their sovereignty and territorial integrity and to advance their national interests. Security seeking in the international system ultimately creates conflict as states adopt defensive measures which may appear offensive to others (Meernik, 2004: 22). As such, realists argue that conflict and war is endemic in the international system since states will go to war if there is a clash of national interest, and where such interests are vital to the existence and survival of a state (Garnett. 2007: 26). In keeping with the above, this section will discuss the underlying causes of war namely human nature, the nation state system and features in the international system that do not promote war but allow it to occur, such as international anarchy, the absence of a structure to prevent war and the distribution of power, which reinforce the expectation of violence and a sense of insecurity.

3.2.1. Human Nature as an Underlying Cause

Realism contains pessimistic assumptions with regard to human nature and this is illustrated by the views taken by the classic realist, Thomas Hobbes, who defined human beings as “inherently destructive, selfish, competitive and aggressive” (Garnett, 2007: 7). Although Hobbes acknowledged that human beings are capable of “kindness and generosity”, he argued that the inherent selfishness and competitiveness in humans are traits that can lead mankind into conflict and war. Classical realists therefore perceived some inherent evil in human nature and argued that human nature and greed for power drove individuals and states to dominate each other (Lynn-Jones, 1999: 57). Realists have argued that the very ability of humans to kill members of their own species for abstract causes can be considered a cause of war, since human nature allows for wars to occur (Ziegler, 2001: 135).

Waltz (1959: 12) advanced three levels of analysis with regard to the cause of war, namely man, the state and the international system, termed the first, second and third images of war respectively. In the first image, Waltz locates the cause of war in the inherent characteristics of man (nature, behavior, acts of individuals), his need for survival and pursuit of his interest and argued that various acts of leaders relating to war are manifestations of personality traits and therefore human nature. He therefore considered human nature an efficient (immediate) cause of

war (Waltz, 1959: 16, 218). On the contrary, Suganami (1996: 18) argues that personality traits and human nature are distinguishable since human nature is part of the character of human beings whereas personality traits are individualistic tendencies. Therefore not all leaders exhibit the same personality traits and some individuals' behavior differs considerably according to circumstances (Suganami, 1996: 16 - 19).

Suganami (1996: 54) argues that human beings are not solitary animals and therefore some behavior is characterised as selfish or callous, but these are not absolute and vary from individual to individual. Human beings can vary their attitudes, their degree of anti-sociability and differentiate their attitudes, and are also able to remain loyal to their society and to co-exist with other societies. Therefore Suganami (1996: 55) argues that human nature is not a necessary condition for war since human beings have the capacity to control anti-social traits, but argues rather that the continued division of humans into a plurality of particularistic societies provides a condition which makes war possible. Although humanity has the ability to attain an undivided universal sociability, societies are still divided between ideological, religious, cultural and ethnic lines which inhibits the formation of a cohesive and unified universal society. It can be argued that the human ability to sustain this division namely "discriminatory sociability" is a necessary condition for war.

From a conservative and liberal perspective, Nelson and Olin (1979) provided an account of the origins and causes of a particular war based on assumptions about human behavior and society. According to the conservative perspective, individuals and nations are inherently aggressive and selfish and wars occur when nations loose their discipline and order (Nelson & Olin, 1979: 9). From a liberal perspective, Nelson and Olin argued that liberal nation states normally behave rationally and co-operatively however the citizens and leaders may be susceptible to misinterpretation and misperception, which can lead to incorrect assumptions about another state's intentions, thereby resulting in conflict. Liberalism views the individual as capable of exercising various inherent rights to life, liberty and property and if a state limits these rights, there could be potential for conflict, domestically and abroad (Nelson & Olin, 1979: 40, 41).

They also explored the social-psychological theory, which centers on elements that cause discontent within the individual in the domestic and international context and which lead to irrational behavior. If man is relatively deprived (of economic benefits, power and political participation); what he receives does not match his expectations, and if deprivation becomes widespread, this could result in group conflict (Nelson & Olin, 1979: 45, 46). Liberal theory does not sufficiently explain causes of war like the realist theory since conflict of interest and other specific factors form a large part of war causation. But it does illustrate how hostility can originate within an individual and society, which can translate into hostility between states (Nelson & Olin, 1979: 47, 48).

War can therefore result from misperception, misunderstanding, miscalculation, errors of judgment, human frailty (part of the character of humans) and the inability of decision makers to perceive the world as it is due to pre-existing concepts. Misperceptions that could lead to war include mistaken estimates of the enemy's intentions or military capabilities; an inaccurate assessment of military balances between adversaries, and failures to judge the risks and consequences of the war. Both sides to the conflict can misjudge the situation, where one side can misjudge the intentions and capabilities of the other, and the other side could underestimate its opponent (Garnett, 2007: 34).

3.2.2. The Nation State System

Waltz (1959: 12) also argued that the cause of war lay in the structure of the state. He defined acts and thoughts of the individual and human nature as forming part of the second image, the state, comprised of individuals, entities and groups. Waltz argued that the immediate causes of war are located in the acts of individual leaders and in the internal structural attributes of the nation state as a system. Leaders are human beings that have personality traits and who perform certain acts as decision makers on behalf of the state. Waltz maintains that if two states were to fight each other, it would be for the interests of the state for instance security and natural resources, considered efficient causes of war (Waltz, 1959: 232 - 234).

Nation states are conceived as unitary actors, each with fixed preferences and different national security interests determined by calculations involving relative capability and geopolitics. Such capabilities will influence a state's behavior, determine the type of polarity in the international system, alliance configurations, conflict propensity and conflict outcomes (Meernik, 2004: 22, 64). Classical realism emphasises that states should attempt to maximize their power to attain their national interests and that power also defines a state's national interest. Structural realism argues that states in an anarchic system do not seek to maximize their power, but rather focus on their survival, and power is the means to the end of survival (Lynn-Jones, 1999: 57, 58). Therefore states seek to maximize their relative power and the anarchic nature of the international environment drives states to seek power since it is key to their survival.

States are engaged in a competitive struggle over political and geo-strategic influence or over strategic resources and therefore if one state perceives an imminent threat to its national interests and security, it may decide to use military force to defend itself (Baylis and Wirtz, 2007: 8). States are still relatively unrestricted in their actions and are free to articulate their own national interests and foreign policies. Those concerned with maximalist security interests, the nature of the international environment and with maintaining hegemony, will feel more compelled to protect their power bases and security and react with military force if their global power position and interests are threatened. Those with minimalist security interests will strive to realise their preferences regarding physical integrity and sovereignty and therefore are likely to react with force only if these are directly threatened (Meernik, 2004: 72, 73). In keeping with the above, Suganami (1996: 25) purports that the division of the international system into sovereign states with different and often conflicting national interests, can be considered both a precondition for conflict as well as for international co-operation as states may often pursue common interests.

Similarly, Nelson and Olin (1979: 40, 41) argued from a liberal perspective that due to the lack of integration among states, war could result from conflicting interests of individual leaders, especially if the option of war carries certain benefits. Liberal theory proposes that one of the causes of war is the existence of authoritarian regimes, which do not promote liberties and which pursue different ideologies and political and economic policies than liberal states. Therefore conflicting ideological foundations of nation states can serve as pre-conditions for conflict.

Nelson and Olin, (1979: 60, 61) assert that group conflict has some implications for structural change since common or conflicting ideals and values in the domestic and international sphere may either disturb or enhance social equilibrium. This theory presupposes that a society has disparate values and ideals and social order are achieved through the mutual accommodation of the material and ideal interests of groups and organisations, but since some groups and organisations are more dominant than others, conflict may arise. This also applies in the international sphere where there is an unequal distribution of power characterised by a continuous struggle for political advantage within and between nation states, which continues under situations of coercion and domination by stronger states or forces within the state.

3.2.3. The International System

Structural realists argued that the most fundamental feature of international politics is its anarchic structure and the distribution of power wherein states seek security, which ultimately shapes the patterns of international politics and foreign policy (Lynn-Jones, 1999: 58). Waltz (1959: 160, 232) advanced that another permissive cause of war is located in the third level, the international system, which he considered an underlying and fundamental cause of war. He argued that the international system allows for the condition in which war is a constant possibility and that states view it rational to be prepared for war due to the system's anarchical nature and the absence of a structure to prevent war. Suganami (1996: 12, 13, 25) on the contrary states that the anarchical nature of the international system is one of the prerequisites of international conflict and of international peace since the system allows for the possibility of conflict as well as prospect for peace and international co-operation. Many defensive realists have argued that the international environment is not necessarily war prone since rational states are able to devise policies to maximize mutual security and that states realise that defensive strategies are best to promote security. Defensive realism retains the traditional realist focus that states are the primary actors and that security and the international system define international politics, but it does not believe that human nature and states are inherently selfish and evil (Lynn-Jones, 2008: 17, 25). Offensive realism, however, believes that the international system fosters conflict and aggression and that states are driven to seek power and therefore adopt offensive strategies. Therefore, when there are several states with offensive strategies, increases

of power will translate into threats and co-operation is more difficult, giving rise to a situation where conflict is possible.

In his later work, "Theory of International Relations" (1979), Waltz purports that the structure of the international system allows for the recurrence of war, regardless of the different structures of states and individual decision makers. Therefore, the international system and anarchy is a constant and fundamental factor that allows for the recurrence of war whilst nation states may explain the occurrence of particular wars. Suganami (1996: 26, 29) holds a different view and argues that international anarchy is not necessarily the sole underlying cause of war since there are other underlying causes. He also argues that international anarchy in which there is no structure to prevent war can be considered a permissive cause of war and not necessarily an underlying one, but international anarchy in a continuously tense and unstable environment can be considered the underlying cause of some wars. Although Waltz argued that wars have different immediate causes and the same underlying causes, the constant state of international anarchy does not explain specific causes of, and individual reasons for war.

Nelson and Olin, (1979: 9) argued from a conservative viewpoint that a decisive balance of power is necessary to keep man's anarchic tendencies in control through the leadership of powerful states in the international system as well as a clearly defined hierarchy to achieve peace and equilibrium of power (Nelson & Olin, 1979: 28, 29). Therefore, war could be avoided if society, state and international relations are organised in a hierarchical system and the flaws and weaknesses inherent in mankind are controlled by dominant leaders and states in the domestic and international arena. Nelson and Olin's argument that a given war is caused by the breakdown of international hierarchy corresponds to Waltz's idea that international anarchy and the absence of a war preventing device is an underlying cause of war (Suganami, 1996: 36, 37).

Suganami (1996: 64, 65, 67) suggests that another underlying cause of war is the human ability to sustain pluralistic societies, hence the division of the world into sovereign states. Sovereign states differentiate their attitudes and policies towards each other and each domestic society is institutionalised into a highly particularistic community in the international system. Therefore, international anarchy can be considered to be a permissive condition in which war occurs as a

result of the inability of pluralistic societies to set up international structures to prevent wars. He (1996: 47) further argues that even if an authoritative structure to prevent conflict existed, there is no guarantee that it would prevent all forms of war, and therefore the absence of an effective mechanism cannot be considered as a necessary condition of war, unless in the presence of a perfect structure, war would not occur at all. But since the international system has become institutionalised through facilitating greater political and economic co-operation between states, anarchy cannot be considered as a sufficient cause of war even though it promotes competition and disputes which do not necessarily lead to war (Suganami, 1996: 50 – 52). Furthermore, for war to be considered inevitable in the absence of a perfect anti-war device, (a necessary condition), all the other necessary conditions for war must be satisfied, such as the deliberate decision and motivation of the nation state to go to war.

In keeping with the above, the international system is characterised by the uneven distribution of military power, which can be considered a permissive cause of war. The components of the distribution of power, for instance human and non-human resources; tangible assets and information, vary with regard to each country (Brown, 1994: 66, 68). The decision by a state to wage war depends upon the kinds of power at its disposal and whether or not it is prepared to use such power in a war situation. Countries that are economically interdependent are likely to invoke other coercive instruments such as economic coercion, withhold aid, suspend political support or initiate dialogue rather than war.

The broad and long term shifts in the global distribution of economic and industrial power have been produced by different degrees of economic modernisation and advancement. Such shifts bring inconsistencies between existing international domains of political control, spheres of influence and hegemon-led coalitions and emerging socio-economic realities. Imperial powers may feel threatened by such realities since these may negate their own political domain and interests and could go to war (hegemonic war) to prevent an adverse change to its power base and hegemonic status or to prevent another country from disrupting the distribution of power and influence in its favour (Brown, 1994: 69). The distribution of power, in general, depends upon the occurrence of war as an instrument to keep functioning and therefore limited wars are often fought to avoid unlimited war (Ziegler, 2001: 210).

3.2.4. The Contribution of Realism to Understanding War Causation

Waltz has contributed significantly to the understanding of how security considerations affect state behavior, to the recurrence of the balance of power among major powers as well as to the structural characteristics of the international system. This has enabled realists to conclude that states seek to capitalize on the power differentials to achieve greater levels of influence and that relative capabilities and the external environment shape individual states' foreign policies (Meernik, 2004: 24). Waltz's tripartite analysis reflects a common view of how modern political and international life is structured, for instance human beings as citizens, which belong to individual states, and states which belong to the international system. His argument that there is no anti-war device in the international system helps theorists understand why some states may perceive it rational to be prepared to engage in military combat and why the competition of security has been exacerbated (Suganami, 1996: 32).

Waltz argued that no single image (human nature, the nation state system and the international system) is sufficient to explain the causes of war since they explain war partially and contain major and minor causes of war (Waltz, 1959: 225, 232). He also characterised efficient causes as immediate and equated permissive causes with the underlying cause of war.

Although realism has contributed significantly to the understanding of war causation, it has been argued that realist theories have ignored culture and identity in international politics, especially since not all states share the same cultures or identities and therefore such differences will account for different behaviors among states. Realists, however, assert that differences in culture and identity have not prevented states from adopting similar behavior or policies especially with regard to war (Lynn-Jones, 1999: 59). Realism has also been criticised for paying less attention to transnational actors and how their actions may influence international relations. Nevertheless, realism believes that the most important actors in international relations are states and therefore focus more on the behavior of individual states and war (Lynn-Jones, 2008: 16).

Conflict in the international system is challenging to resolve since there is no global authoritative institution to create justice and to impose the rule of law. Therefore realism argues that states

have adopted a self help approach to their national interests and security and hence may decide to use military force if they feel their interests are threatened. But although war is possible in the absence of a structure of authority, there is no guarantee that war would be prevented in its presence, since it would not necessarily be effective. Furthermore, an underlying cause of war embedded in the nation state and in the international system is not necessarily the major or sole cause of war since there are other causes of war such as those unconscious and conscious motives of leaders, specific reasons, aggravating conditions and trigger causes, of varying degrees of importance.

Although realism cannot offer a means to eliminate conflict, it can provide an understanding as to the various causes of war inherent in the structure of the international system and in the nation state as a subsystem. Realist theory can therefore guide decision makers on how best to manage war through implementing various strategies to minimize the likelihood of the occurrence of conflict and violence (Baylis and Wirtz, 2007: 7). Realism can encourage decision makers to be cautious since it emphasises the importance of a state being aware of an adversary's power and intentions (Lynn-Jones, 2008: 16). Such theories cannot explain the foreign policy behavior of states but it allows for drawing certain inferences about the kinds of issues and developments that could lead individual states to use military force to advance their security interests (Meernik, 2004: 71). Realist theories also highlight that although a certain measure of peace is possible, the lack of reason, the competitiveness and basic human nature of human beings, will allow for conflict and violence to manifest itself in one form or another.

This section covered the main underlying causes of war, namely human nature, the nation state system and the international system, which allow for war to occur. Nevertheless, underlying causes are not the sole sources of war and there are other conscious and unconscious motives as well as reasons which act as triggers and provoke states to go to war. The next section will discuss the conscious and unconscious motives for war (which may be considered hidden reasons for war) as well as the declared reasons for war which may be more short term and specific than causes, and can lead to particular wars.

4. MOTIVES AND REASONS FOR WAR

This section will discuss the conscious and unconscious motives for war as well as the process a decision maker goes through when deciding, either consciously or unconsciously, on the need to go to war. Theorists have identified human nature as a permissive and underlying cause of war, which implies that humans use reason, logic and choice when deciding on whether to go to war or not. Ultimately, it is the ability of humans to decide on a particular action that eventually may lead to war. This discussion will incorporate risk taking and assessment that the decision maker is subjected to prior to making a choice and taking a decision. Although motives and reasons differ, the two are discussed in the same section since motives may imply hidden or undeclared reasons that a leader may have for deciding to go to war. When taking a decision to go to war, a leader may not always disclose the specific motives for war but will provide other reasons to justify the action. Moreover, conscious and unconscious motives may be specific to the individual leader and are often far removed from the interests of the state. Therefore, a leader's decision to go to war may be based on specific reasons but will also sometimes be influenced by individual motives. A clear distinction between declared and undeclared reasons will be made in the discussion pertaining to the reasons for war.

4.1. Conscious and Unconscious Motives for War

Conscious and unconscious motives for war are located within man and can refer to the choice and deliberate decision by a leader to go to war. Most leaders have an instrumental view of war and some regard it as a rational tool for policy implementation in the pursuit of national interests. As such leaders may believe that war is a result of a calculated, purposive, and conscious decision whereas scientists will argue that war is rather a result of unconscious drives and weaknesses of individuals. For the most part, wars are not always a matter of rational calculation or cost benefit analysis and are rather far removed from rational policy (Garnett, 2007: 33, 34). The decision by a nation state to go to war would be considered a deliberate choice, but there are more compelling causes or reasons which may influence a leader's decision to go to war (Suganami, 1996: 30).

Prior to war, states normally conduct a risk assessment and cost analysis to determine the risks, costs and the benefits of going to war, taking into account the salience of the national interests threatened and the degree of commitment to protect these. But decision makers are not always able to define the level of acceptable risk, therefore resorting to war at a great cost. In calculating cost and risk of war, the decision maker takes into account various external variables such as the structural attributes of the international system, the reaction of the major powers, the target state government and its military capability as well as internal factors such as the states own military capability, economic strength and the domestic political consequences (Vertzberger, 1998: 6).

Since the international environment is very dynamic, complex and uncertain, the decision maker is often inhibited from deciding on the most appropriate solution and therefore may take risks with unintended consequences. Risk taking behavior is an important task in international relations due to misperceptions, misunderstandings and lack of trust and effective communication between states (Vertzberger, 1998: 31, 32, 40). Decision makers will base cost assessments of war on economic, political and human life values and compare the costs of alternative forms of action (Vertzberger, 1998: 38).

The risks of war are assessed, accepted or rejected at the political military level and by the military command. Although the goal of an assured victory may appear a low risk at the military level (due to an advantage in military power), it may appear as a high risk at the political level, due to the political consequences that could result from the war, namely international responses. The salience of perceived costs compared with that of gains is an important consideration in decisions to take or avoid risks. If decision makers frame the option of resorting to war as an opportunity that can yield gains, it is likely that the leader will decide on war. Decision makers who emphasise the losses of resorting to war will in all likelihood try to avoid it (Vertzberger, 1998: 35, 37).

4.2. Reasons for War

Reasons why war is fought are more specific and can apply to particular circumstances, individual countries or to the political and economic dynamics in a region. Each state will have

different reasons for going to war. Some may be attributed to long standing issues and others may manifest themselves as a result of a policy pursued by a state. In general, theories have not discussed such reasons in detail, but these can be clearly distinguished from the causes of war identified in the preceding chapter in that reasons imply some material or tangible interest or motive. Reasons for war may include conflicting political interests or economic disputes such as over the distribution of various resources. In view of the fact that this study relates to the causes of and reasons for the 2003 Second Gulf War, and since the declared and undeclared reasons will be explored in the following chapters, it is necessary to distinguish these concepts. Declared reasons for going to war may typically include those that a state puts forward as a justification for war, for instance the aggressor may be harboring and assisting a terrorist group, or in the case of the 2003 Second Gulf War, the aggressor is alleged to have WMD, which could possibly be used against another state. Undeclared reasons refer more specifically to those reasons that a state may not wish to disclose since they do not justify war, for instance to claim part of a territory, to gain control over strategic resources, or to gain geo-political influence.

In the international system, conflicts of interests are unavoidable since these derive from differences in social positions, roles, power, capabilities and characteristics of individuals, social groups, states and alliances of states (Nikitin, 2000: 6). Reasons could also be considered to be efficient causes since they are connected to the particular circumstances surrounding individual wars. In the international system, interstate and intrastate wars are fought on a basis of a combination of reasons and causes. Wars fought over economic and natural resources are often met with political interstate as well as cultural and ideological contradictions (Nikitin, 2000: 4).

The reasons for war as discussed below will mainly focus on the material reasons, which include natural and industrial resources; security, post-industrial resources and arms races; poverty; social reasons which include the domestic structure of a state and ethnicity, and lastly cultural reasons such as religion. Some of these factors, such as natural resources, ethnicity, religion and poverty, can also be considered as reasons for intrastate war.

4.2.1. Material Interests

Material reasons for war are diverse and include the right of a state to protect its territory and physical assets; the right to protect its economic assets and the right to advance its security and to build-up its military arsenal. Furthermore, war can also arise out of a competition between states or groups for natural resources, oil and water as well as from competition over industrial infrastructure, sources of energy and financial resources. The reasons for war are not limited to the above mentioned but could also include those factors (where the linkages are weak) such as arms races which promote war, as well as poverty, where a desperately poor group or state finds special financial resources to stage conflict.

4.2.1.1. Natural and Industrial Resources

Territorial integrity is a vital national interest and if the territory of a state is violated, it will likely retaliate against the aggressor since a violation of territorial integrity is considered an act of war. A state can also have extra-territorial assets and interests, located outside of the national territorial jurisdiction. An attack on such assets is not always considered an act of war and the target state might decide against retaliation unless these territorial assets are of strategic significance and of great economic value (Brown, 1994: 51).

Economic dominance has become one of the key determinants of a state's international power and therefore, states may go to war to protect their economic prosperity and to ensure control of strategic resources and flow of investments (Meernik, 2004: 8, 9). Where resources are scarce, states and groups can seek access to limited supplies since resources often define wealth and power and the economic and political strength of a group or state. Interstate wars may often result out of economic disparities between states with high living standards and low birth rates, and states with low living standards and high birth rates, with the stronger state exploiting the weaker. Civil wars have been fought over economic resources where some groups and minorities have been denied access to these as well as for a source of income to fuel conflict (to buy weapons for war) for political purposes for instance to enable a particular group to assert itself over the ruling élite (Nikitin: 2000: 6, 7).

War may be fought to protect the rights of a single multinational corporation; to extend the principles of free market capitalism, or to acquire certain economic advantages to advance a state's economic well-being. Economic interests have provided the necessary and efficient conditions for using force especially with regard to US economic interests (Meernik, 2004: 76, 77). States will rightly retaliate against an aggressor to prevent the latter from destroying its economic base. But a war waged to claim the economic assets of another state is not considered just (Brown, 1994: 53). According to Marxist/Leninist assumptions, states may often go to war to claim markets abroad in order to invest surplus capital and to sell goods that cannot be absorbed domestically in their markets; whereas the dependency and world system theories argue that capitalist and industrialised nations look outward to undeveloped states to seek raw materials, foreign markets and foreign investment, perpetuating economic domination over the poor nations. Core nations (powerful and wealthy states) will only use force occasionally when their dominance in the periphery is threatened or when foreign gains and markets are under threat (Meernik, 2004: 77, 78).

Competition for rare and valuable natural resources, such as oil, gas, minerals, gold, uranium and copper, may result in both intrastate and interstate conflict. Since these assets are immobile, the gain or loss of a territory containing them is a matter of economic and geo-political interest to powers. War is more likely to occur should these resources be scarce; shared by a number of groups, and should alternative sources be unavailable. When resources such as water extend beyond a political border, water disputes between states, ethnic groups and economic classes are likely to occur. A weaker group or state competing for scarce resources is unlikely to resort to war against the stronger party unless it controls the resource (Ehrlich & Gleick, 2000: 3, 5).

In Third World countries, the income from the exploitation of resources accounts for the larger part of national revenue, but such revenue has often been misappropriated and diverted from development projects which would benefit communities. In such countries, groups competing for resources (diamonds, gold, copper) have ended up in conflict and the mere existence of natural resources in these countries has fueled conflict by providing means to purchase weapons and achieving political power (Nikitin, 2000: 7). Therefore the competition for resources has often defined the relationship between the political ruling élites and communities in developing

countries. Conflict in developing countries may also arise out of the inequitable distribution, use and development of resources leading to economic marginalisation of some groups.

4.2.1.2. Security, Post-Industrial Resources and Arms Race

Some states may perceive resorting to war as a viable option to maintain their military advantage over other states and to avoid a disadvantageous balance of military capability (Brown, 1994: 54). A nation state will normally aspire to maintain large military arsenals and establishments as part of its defense capability to prevent or retaliate against an attack. The basic realist view is that even democracies with a relatively peaceful disposition are compelled to maintain sufficient military capability to be able to deter and use force against an attacker. But often, maintaining significant military arsenals and the acquisition of military technology can be misconstrued by some states as an impending threat, leading to arms races and possibly war.

In general states are motivated to build up their arms to increase the diplomatic weight of the country, to provide security and as a means to deter aggression as well as driven by profits made from weapon production and the careers that may be advanced by deploying them. According to Ziegler (1990: 256, 257), arms races do not invariably cause war but may promote it, since the very existence of weapons technologies may tempt states to employ them.

Although the linkage between military technology, arms buildup and conflict is often blurred, the very existence of military technologies in regions characterised by conflict demonstrates that those countries need to defend themselves against possible aggression. Often, arms competition can be considered to be a precursor for conflict since weapons acquisitions are likely to impact on the stability of the current military balances of states, and the relationship of such balances with actual causes of war. If an arms race is introduced in an environment that is inherently unstable with a history of conflict, war could occur between the adversaries since new weapons will raise suspicions and heighten the perception of threat (Kemp, 2001: 69). There is no fixed line what the optimal armament levels should be in an adversarial relationship but what may be perceived by one country to be the optimum for deterring aggression may be perceived by another as threatening (Brown, 1994: 94, 95). However, if the accumulation of arms takes place

in an environment which is stable and where adversaries tend to resolve differences through dialogue, weapons acquisitions are less likely to lead to war.

The transfer of weapons to undemocratic countries has had negative repercussions, resulting in war, strengthening corrupt dictators, promoting aggressive behaviour and enabling groups to exploit natural resources to fuel conflict. Arms transfers to unstable governments in developing countries pose problems since they often are unable to absorb, maintain and operate the advanced equipment which leaves such arms open to exploitation, theft and covert purchase by groups which wish to change the status quo by rebellion, mutiny, civil war or revolution. Although arms races in the developed world have not been the main causes of war in recent years, arms transfers to the developing world have contributed to conflict and war since the recipients of such weapons have a greater propensity for conflict given the political and social environments of these countries (Kemp, 2001: 70, 73).

If there is a large imbalance of military power between adversaries, where one country is dissatisfied with the present relationship, the imbalance may incite the dissatisfied state to engage in conflict. A substantial imbalance in military power is considered a necessary determinant of conflict, but not a sufficient one (Brown, 1994: 94). If the gross imbalance favours the side which is satisfied with the present condition, war is unlikely. Nevertheless, gross imbalances of power will induce countries to build up their military arsenal and make decisions and take actions that could precipitate war.

4.2.1.3. Poverty

Since the access to, and utilisation of resources determines wealth and income disposition of groups, it is discussed as part of this section. The linkage between poverty and cause of war is not clear and difficult to define since there are other significant proactive causes of war. Poverty can act as a contributing factor to war if the poor are aware of the great divergences of incomes and advantages that another group has. Income gaps between the poor and the rich may result in discontent and tensions, often manifesting in violent riots. Sometimes poverty in developing countries is a result of poor governance and failure to address inequalities as well as the unequal

distribution of power and resources between groups (Miller, 2000: 2, 3). This situation would in time result in tension and grievances between groups with uneven access to resources and power and possibly lead to war. But for the most part, poverty alone is not a cause of war, since the poor in many developing countries are forced by their governments to accept their condition.

Small-scale armed conflicts in the form of riots, civil conflict and societal breakdown could occur in developing countries if poverty is a contributing factor amongst other significant causes of war, but such wars would be limited to countries that are poor and undemocratic and with weak democratic institutions. If a war would result out of poverty, it would be instigated by the élite and armed forces against the rioting poor or, poor against poor, with different ethnic backgrounds and against a backdrop of the elite exploiting the poor. Poverty can be considered a cause of war if there is an increasing degree of deprivation and intensity of grievance; a decreasing accessibility of means to air grievances; a sense that poor conditions can be improved through violence, and the spread of grievances of a large scale (Miller, 2000: 5, 6).

4.2.2. Social Reasons for War

The specific causes of war which originate within the social sphere can be found in internal and international politics and ethnic relations. The political causes of war within a state may be derived from redistribution of power between groups, élites or classes; the desire for self-determination by specific groups within a state; level of democratization, forms of government and political regimes (Nikitin, 2000: 1, 4).

War between states may be derived from disputes over borders; alliances; treaties and legal obligations and the level of integration between states. In terms of ethnic relations as a specific cause of intrastate war, the contributing factors are the level of autonomy; political representation of minorities; structure of governing; access of ethnic groups and nations to power and resources, self determination, and secession (Watson & Boag, 2000: 4).

4.2.2.1. Domestic Structure of a State and Democracies

Often the domestic structure of a nation state affects the government's decisions on whether to promote peace or engage in war. According to liberal democrats, states that are structured along democratic principles of representation and institutions that enforce accountability are less prone to engage in military action as opposed to those that are autocratic. Usually, democracies that promote human rights and fundamental freedoms, accountability and transparency and economic growth will advance these goals in their foreign policy agenda. A country's inclination to go to war will also be determined by the stage of economic development, social economic class and communal groups, and therefore the more economically advanced a state is, the less inclined it will be to go to war, unless its interests are threatened (Brown, 1994: 77). Foreign interventions and wars are difficult to initiate in the contemporary international system, since they require national and international support.

Pacific states or democracies are less inclined to go to war with each other or against an authoritarian or totalitarian state, but there is no significant correlation between a democracy and the non-involvement in war or between a lack of democracy and the initiation of war. However, for the most part, there are very few instances in which pluralistic democracies have fought each other. The political structure of countries may define the objectives for which countries may use military force. A government with unlimited executive authority presiding over a domestic system with little political competition is more likely to go to war to strengthen its power base. Governments with competitive pluralistic organised polities will more likely involve themselves in wars over the legitimacy over particular forms of government. Irrespective of the fact that democracies are less inclined to go to war (due to their structural inhibitions and dependency upon each other for trade and development) than are autocratic or totalitarian regimes, this does not mean that they are less reluctant to go to war (Dannreuther, 2007: 18).

4.2.2.2. Ethnicity

Although more related to intrastate than interstate wars, ethnicity where warring factions (of different personal and social identity) have clashed over political power, dominance and the

struggle for scarce resources is often a cause of violent conflict. Ethnicity is often viewed in relation to a pursuit of an objective in the context of individual and collective self interest and it offers a valuable strategy for securing power, advantage and access to resources. Political élites in developing countries control scarce resources and more than often manipulate cultural forms, social characteristics, values and practices of ethnic groups. In view of the different collective identities, warring factions that oppose the government and those that defend it, have opposing explanations for the necessity of violence (Watson & Boag, 2000: 1, 2).

Ethnic groups are distinguishable from each other in that each group is characterised by shared history, different language, dialect, custom, tradition and religion which serve to promote internal cohesion within the group resulting in a conscious differentiation from other groups. Cultural characteristics and practices are the basis for ethnic identification of members of a group from other groups which are seen as competitors in the struggle for the same interest or advantage. This differentiation can therefore promote violence between groups where there is a conflict of interest or where one group feels marginalised by another group which has assumed dominance. If there is a situation of political domination which results in inter-ethnic polarization, communities may become violent especially in defence of ethnic boundaries. War and conflict involving different ethnic groups therefore takes place against a backdrop of identity and difference, social prejudice and discrimination.

4.2.3. Cultural Reasons For War

Cultural reasons also drive nations into war and these include religion, ethno-linguistic culture, and ideologies. Nations which share similar political systems, religion and ethno-linguistic culture may hesitate to go to war with each other whereas those nations which have opposing political systems, religious identification and ethno-linguistic culture, are more war prone (Brown, 1994: 50).

States can resort to war over competing views of ideology and religion. The willingness of states to resort to war emanates from a conviction that the nation state's way of life is the best way for the entire international system (Brown, 1994: 55). A state may decide to resort to war if another

state challenges it by way of subverting the state's way of life by supporting groups that reject the current government (Meernik, 2004: 123).

Universal secular ideologies can further induce states to go to war. If there is an ideologically based threat which would threaten the existence of the ideologies of one of the powers, it is possible that such a power would resort to war to prevent the threat from engulfing its ideological base and from spreading its sphere of influence.

In the past religion has been a primary cause of war. However, in the contemporary world, religious differences have played a lesser part in initiating conflict although it can still be a contributing factor especially in intrastate conflict. Religion is closely associated with ethnicity and may therefore serve to differentiate a group from another based on religious beliefs and practices. Some religious groups often tend to condemn other faiths, and this is a strong basis for promoting conflict between different faiths. Fundamentalists have a rigid observance of their faith and are unwilling to acknowledge other religions. Various conflicts have taken place based on religion such as those between the Catholic and the Protestants, Christianity versus Islam and Hindu versus Muslim (Watson & Boag, 2000: 7).

Overall, reasons for war are specific and can derive from the interests of individual states, for instance to gain a particular territory; to seize strategic resources from another state, or to defend its human and non-human resources from aggression. Specific reasons can also be short term in nature especially if these relate to expansionist objectives of a leader. The reasons for intrastate and interstate war as discussed in this section will apply to individual wars in varying degrees. Some wars may occur as a result of a combination of these reasons or as a response to various opportunities or threats that manifest themselves. War may result from individual ambitions of leaders; if a leader believes an opportunity has manifested itself to exploit a weaker state, and if a particular threat has manifested itself that could negatively affect the status quo of a given state. Sometimes states may provide reasons to justify going to war, for instance the discovery of an aggressor's overt military activities. Some wars may be attributed to self-serving reasons such as to gain geo-political influence or political leverage, or to force a particular government to

implement a policy change. Moreover, latent conflict may be aggravated by greed; the will to engage in conflict, and the desire by powerful states to maintain their status.

The incongruent expectations of states; opposing national interests and capabilities; and socio-cultural differences which include cultural, ideological, religious and ethnic differences, may be considered necessary reasons for war, for without any such differences, war would not occur.

Weapons and arms races can be considered a necessary component for war since without arms, modern war would not be possible. Since war implies the use of weapons, it is logical to assume that in an arms race, countries are preparing themselves for possible war. The reasons for interstate war and intrastate wars also differ. The contributing factors to war, such as poverty, ethnicity and religion, will mostly define intrastate war. For the most part, human nature, the nation state and the international system (as it is structured) allow war, but its actual occurrence is attributed to tangible interests; to arms races; hostility and distrust between states, as well as miscalculation and error in judgment on the part of the decision maker and leader.

5. CONCLUSION

Traditional realists argue that the decline in interstate war is only temporary and that traditional great power military competition could arise in the future, possibly between the US and China, out of power and security concerns. Some realists argue that most economically and politically powerful states, such as the US, Europe and Japan, will not be inclined to go to war with each other due to their interdependence relating to various political, economic, social and cultural issues. Other theorists argue that war between emerging powers, namely Russia, China and India, despite their dissatisfaction with their international status, is unlikely, since the costs of war and benefits from engagement with the global economy act as constraints against military confrontation (Dannreuther, 2007: 19). Nevertheless, war and conflict remain a constant in international politics, driven by various conflicts of interests ranging from power and security goals; economic interests of acquisition and expansion; ideology; competition over scarce resources, and over political power and dominance.

The end of the Cold War inspired the revision of the understanding of international security and how the international system functions. Due to post-modernity and the process of globalisation, and various changes that have taken place in the international system, there have been distinct changes in the forms of warfare, also inspired by the changing perceptions of threat. These broader changes in the international political and cultural environment have not only promoted changes in the form of warfare, but also brought non-state actors into the battlefield.

It can be concluded that the causes of war are general in nature, and are considered to be underlying features that exist in human nature, the nation state system and in the international system. In terms of human nature, the inherent characteristics of man (selfishness and competitiveness), and his need to survive and to pursue his interests, can be considered as an efficient cause of war as the selfish tendencies in human nature allow war to occur. However, people have different personalities and are capable of selfless acts. Therefore, human nature is not a necessary condition for war, but in view of the fact that the international system is made up of a plurality of societies divided along cultural, religious and ideological lines, war is possible if there is conflict of interest between them. Moreover, human beings are susceptible to misinterpretation and misunderstanding, which often lead to incorrect assumptions of each other's intentions. Some leaders have the political will to resolve disputes and misunderstandings through constructive means, but if war carries certain tangible benefits, a leader may choose to wage war.

The nation state system can be considered as an efficient cause of war since individual leaders will take decisions on behalf of the state, and in its interest. States are competitive entities that function in an anarchical international system, and since their actions are relatively unrestricted, they may wage war to protect their national interests, to increase their power or to maintain their hegemonic status. Conflicting interests of individual leaders and states may therefore be considered immediate causes of war. The international system and its anarchic nature reinforce the possibility that conflict can occur anywhere in the system, especially since there is no structure to prevent war, and therefore it can be considered as a permissive cause of war. The international system and the distribution of power allow for war to occur in a continuously unstable environment and as such, states will usually be prepared for war, seek power and adopt

offensive strategies. Nevertheless, most wars have the same underlying causes but particular wars will have different reasons.

There are a multitude of reasons that can motivate a state to go to war and these vary in each war. States may decide to go to war over material interests, namely to protect their physical assets, or to gain control over sources of energy, as well as over economic reasons as a response to currency devaluation or to claim foreign markets. Many wars have been fought over economic interests, although this is not always a declared reason. Many intrastate wars have resulted out of disputes over the inequitable distribution of economic resources and the desire by groups to gain access to them. Moreover, resources have often been exploited for revenue to purchase weapons as part of a larger war effort against a ruling élite.

Poverty and ethnicity may contribute to intrastate war in a situation where people are increasingly deprived of basic necessities and where there is a belief that violence could improve their well-being. Similarly, states and groups within a state can resort to war over ideology and religion. Although ideological inclinations and interests are not frequent reasons for interstate war, these can contribute to intrastate war where religious and cultural identities of certain groups are frequently suppressed by ruling governments.

In terms of arms races, weapon proliferation perpetuates the cycle of violence and conflict as this provides states the leverage to wage war. Some states may decide to go to war in order to deplete old stocks of weapons to allow weapons production and to increase profits for the military-defence industry. Studies have argued that the frequency of intrastate wars have increased given that old weapons are often transferred to the periphery, where the political and social environments are fertile for conflict and if an arms race takes place in a region that is unstable, this is likely to promote the occurrence of war. Nevertheless, arms races are the result of an inherently unstable international system, which is driven by the competing interests of individual states and other political forces.

For as long as nation states will pursue their different national and material interests, opposing ideologies and different domestic structures, there is bound to be a conflict of interest. In

addition, the lack of communication, misperception and misunderstandings will continue to lead states into drawing incorrect assessments of each others capabilities and intentions, often resulting in unnecessary war. War will continue to a be a long standing feature of international relations since the world maintains its anarchic structure and given that nation states continue to pursue diverse vital interests.

Having discussed the theory related to the causes of and reasons for war, the following chapter will examine the 1991 Gulf War and the declared reasons put forward by the US for its participation in the war to liberate Kuwait from Iraq. This will serve as a background to the discussion of the 2003 Second Gulf War in subsequent chapters.

CHAPTER THREE

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO THE FIRST GULF WAR: 1990 - 1991

1. INTRODUCTION

The First Gulf War against Iraq in 1991 (with US participation), took place shortly after Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990. In view of the US participation in both the Gulf Wars against Iraq, it is possible that the 1991 Gulf War served as a background to the 2003 US-led Gulf War against Iraq. Analysts argue that the 2003 war took place to address the unresolved issue of Iraq's alleged WMD and to contain Iraq's regional ambitions, which surfaced during its war with Iran in 1980 (Hallenberg, 2005: 24).

Prior to its partial destruction after the 1991 Gulf War, Iraq's nuclear programme was the largest undertaken by any Arab state. Nevertheless, the United Nations (UN) embargo on Iraq and years of United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) and International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) inspections obstructed Iraq's nuclear programme. After several years of inspections (from 1991 – 1998), UNSCOM concluded that Iraq possessed several components for the manufacture of a nuclear bomb, and that it worked on various delivery systems (Venter, 2004: 108, 113). Since inspectors, however, could also not verify the total destruction of Iraq's declared programmes, there was a divergence of opinion as to Iraq's ability to build WMD.

At the start of the 1979 Iranian revolution, there was a shift in US policy towards Iraq in support of the latter's 1980 war against Iran (Abd Al Jabbar, 1991: 213). The restoration of US relations with Iraq in 1984 ensured stemming arms supplies to Iran; discouraged the world market from purchasing Iranian oil; contained the spread of Iranian radical Islamic fundamentalism, and diverted Iraq's attention away from the former Soviet Union (Sciolino, 1991: 159). After Saddam Hussein claimed victory over Iran in 1988, he reshaped his Ba'athist ideology to reflect a semi-Marxist radical nationalism of the early 1970s. In 1990, he presented the annexation of

Kuwait as part of his new indigenous revolutionary movement towards Arab unity and to rectify Kuwait's separation from Iraq by British imperialists (Tripp, 2002: 253). After Kuwait's liberation, United Nations Security Council (UNSC) resolutions called for Iraq to eliminate its biological, chemical and nuclear weapons and to submit to mandated UN weapons inspections (Venter, 2004: 61). Iraq's non-compliance to UNSC resolutions over the years reinforced US suspicions that Iraq regenerated its WMD capability and this served as a build-up to the 2003 Gulf War.

In order to analyse the 2003 war, the events leading up to the 1991 First Gulf War, which include the Iran/Iraq war in 1980 as well as Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, will be discussed. Moreover, the US objectives in its intervention in the 1991 Gulf War will be examined to illustrate the US declared and alleged undeclared reasons, for its participation in the 1991 war. Overall, this chapter aims at providing an understanding of how the unattained objectives of the First Gulf War may have infiltrated the decision making process in the build up to the 2003 Gulf War. In view of the fact that oil has been used as a key method of confrontation between the West and the Gulf States, the next section will firstly outline the significance of oil, and how this resource has influenced regional political dynamics. Since oil policies in the Gulf are unpredictable and often unstable, the chapter will also draw a link between the need by the West (the US) to interfere in the oil politics of the region and the need to secure access to the region's vast oil resources.

2. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF GULF OIL

The often turbulent relations between Arab countries (especially during the Gulf War) have been shaped by the region's vast oil resources and the political power that oil revenue has provided Arab governments. Oil has enabled Gulf governments (Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain and the United Arab Emirates - UAE) to amass enormous wealth (Gause, 2004: 43). Despite the fact that the oil industry has produced enormous revenue, Gulf States have not always used oil wealth to promote development, modernise their economies, or to privatise state industry. On the contrary, they have neglected their populations; failed to implement energy investment strategies, and

have overspent on military forces and arms imports, consequently leading to rising socio-economic pressures and political instability (Cordesman, 2004: 60).

The Middle East (especially the Gulf) is of political and economic importance for Western powers, since it contains about 674 billion barrels of proven oil reserves (Cordesman, 2004: 152). Since the supply of oil and energy production has been affected by security related issues such as militarism; arms imports; weapons proliferation; Islamic extremism and violence, and state supported terrorism, the US considers the stability of the region as critical to prevent potential threats to the region's development and energy exports and to ensure access to, and transportation of oil resources (Cordesman, 2004: 71, 85, 90). The Gulf Wars also illustrate US interest in ensuring the uninterrupted supply of oil and access to the region's oil rich fields.

The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) states, such as Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and the UAE, have not always observed the oil production quota system, and have intentionally lowered oil prices leading to an oversupply of oil on world markets and oil shocks since oil supply was not met by an equivalent world demand. This illustrates the importance the US attaches to its involvement in Middle Eastern political and economic dynamics and, where such involvement includes arming and militarising the region, interfering in OPEC, trade barriers, market manipulations of commodity prices and military intervention (Gause, 2004:179, 180).

Moreover, the Gulf region has been susceptible to political and economic turmoil due to the consequences of the overproduction of, and supply of oil and oil price wars, often linked to the Arab/Israeli conflict. Gulf governments have used the oil resource as part of a regional confrontation involving Israel and this can be illustrated by the oil shock of 1973 when Arab states reduced production by 5 per cent and threatened to cut supply by 5 per cent each month unless Israeli forces withdrew from the occupied Palestinian territories (Gause, 2004: 179, 180). Many Arab states have used the Israeli/Arab conflict to tarnish the image of the US as Israel's ally and have linked this to ceasing oil supplies to the West as a bargaining tool for the US to disengage militarily from the region and from Israel (Cordesman, 2004: 88).

The following section will briefly discuss Iraq's invasion of Iran in 1980 and its invasion of Kuwait in 1990, as well as how the decision to invade Kuwait was influenced by opposing oil policies in the region. Moreover, the discussion will also seek to establish a link between Iraq's quest for regional military dominance and its role in the region's energy production; its invasion of Kuwait, and the consequent coalition attack on Iraq in 1991. The discussion will also highlight several unresolved issues that may have been pertinent to the US invasion of Iraq in 2003.

3. THE BEGINNING OF IRAQ'S REGIONAL AMBITIONS

The 1991 Gulf War was mainly attributed to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990. This section will briefly discuss Iraq's regional ambitions with respect to the above as well as set out the alleged reasons for its invasion of Kuwait. Iraq's invasion of Iran in 1980 provided Iraq with power and regional leverage. But the after-effects of the war compelled Saddam Hussein to recover the financial costs of the war, which he believed he could do by invading Kuwait. In view of the fact that Kuwait was, and is an important source of oil for the US, Iraq's invasion of Kuwait forced the US to change its policies with respect to Iraq and the region. With its invasion of Kuwait, Iraq was viewed with suspicion by the US and its allies, moreover since the question of Iraq's WMD remained largely unresolved.

3.1. Iraq's Invasion of Iran (1980)

Since 1978, Hussein was determined to fill a leadership vacuum in the region to project Iraq as a wealthy, military powerful, politically stable country in the Gulf and to advocate common Arab goals (Tripp, 2001: 231). For Hussein, containing Iranian Islamic Fundamentalism meant asserting Iraq's leadership of the Arab world; asserting his dedication to the Arab cause, and securing the allegiance of the Sunni Arab population in Iraq, which were vital to his inner network (Abd Al Jabbar, 1991: 212). Iraq was antipathetic towards the anti-modernisation Islamic regime in Iran and Hussein perceived the Iranian regime as an ideological threat (Sciolino, 1991: 107, 108). This notwithstanding, the war with Iran was aimed mainly to reverse the 1975 agreement (signed between Iran, Iraq and backed by the US and Britain) which settled the dispute between Iraq and Iran over their borders, especially the Shatt al-Arab waterway.

Therefore, Iraq hoped that its war with Iran would ensure Iraq's access to the province of Khuzestan; access to the Arab islands annexed by Iran in 1971, as well as ensure Iraq's control of the Shatt al-Arab waterway, and access to the Arab Gulf region.

On 22 September 1980, Hussein invaded Iran. The war was one of attrition. From 1982 – 1986, Iraq used offensive measures which included the use of chemical weapons in 1984 to defeat superior numbers of Iranian forces and massed infantry attacks. Both Iraq and Iran fought inconsistently and despite some initial Iraqi victories, Iran launched counterattacks, which consequently resulted in heavy casualties on both sides. Hostilities ended in August 1988, with no change to the political status quo, after both sides agreed to a cease-fire based on UNSC Resolution 598. (Iraq Survey Group, 2004a: 41)

3.2. Iraq's Invasion of Kuwait

Despite Iraq's war with Iran, Hussein did not achieve his aims, namely gaining control of the Shatt al-Arab waterway and gaining access to the province of Khuzestan (occupation of oil rich regions of Iran) (Tripp, 2002: 252). Nevertheless, Iraq's victory weakened the Iranian ideological and military threat and Hussein emerged as an influential leader in the Arab world. He decided to further his regional ambitions and on 2 August 1990, invaded Kuwait. In so doing, he subjected his country to economic deterioration; plunged the oil markets into chaos, and destroyed the regional balance of power (Sciolino, 1991: 13).

Hussein thought that he could foster Arab unity by invading Kuwait, and that this unity would counter the military power and influence of the Western powers and leave Iraq with the responsibility of leader in the region. Instead, this resulted in a transformation of the security architecture and a shift in the strategic balance of power in the region (Al Shayji, 2008: 2). This section will briefly explain the reasons for Hussein's invasion of Kuwait, namely Iraq's economic predicament; the Iraqi/Kuwaiti border dispute; allegations of Kuwait's intention to raise its oil production quota, as well as allegations of illegal Iraqi oil extraction by Kuwait.

3.2.1. Iraq's Political and Economic Predicament

Hussein's decision to invade Kuwait derived partly from Iraq's internal situation, largely owed to the heavy debt situation created by the war with Iran. He believed that invading Kuwait would settle his debt estimated at between US \$ 80 billion to US \$ 200 billion. The war on Iran resulted in Iraq's dependence on oil for revenue and other industries provided insufficient revenue to sustain Iraq's import based economy (Yousif, 1991: 53). Hussein could not afford to finance development and reconstruction projects and this undermined his position as a leader. Consequently, he started to liberalise the economy and removed price controls; encouraged entrepreneurial activity, and granted licenses to private industrial projects until the private sector accounted for a quarter of all imports (Sciolino, 1991: 187, 101). Iraq faced a debt burden of over 50 per cent of Iraq's oil income in 1990. Oil revenue was unable to account for the costs of reconstruction, the continuing weakness of the price of oil and a military and civil bill. Hussein tried to persuade OPEC countries (Saudi Arabia and Kuwait) to increase their price of oil through restrictive quotas and to provide Iraq grants; as well as to reschedule foreign debts repayments and/or to consider the loans extended to Iraq during its war with Iran as a grant. But Kuwait insisted that Iraq repay the loans. Since Iraq's calls for restitution and relief from Kuwait went unanswered, and, in addition to other material reasons (territorial dispute between Iraq and Kuwait), Hussein decided to invade Kuwait (Venter, 2004: 92).

3.2.2. Territorial Dispute Between Iraq and Kuwait

Iraq's invasion of Kuwait also arose over a territorial dispute with the latter, since the territory of Iraq was demarcated by the British Empire. In 1922, Britain suggested that the "green line", set out in the 1913 Anglo-Ottoman Treaty should be accepted as the Iraq-Kuwait northern boundary, which ran from the junction of Wadi al-Audjah with the Batin, eastwards to the south to the islands of Bubiyan and Warbah and along the coast of the Najd-Kuwait frontier. In 1965, Kuwait signed an agreement with Britain to this effect (Preston, 2003: 198, 199). Iraq's claim to Kuwait dates back to the Ottoman Empire time when Kuwait was a district of the Basra province administered by the Sheikh of Kuwait (Issa, 2008: 3). Successive Iraqi governments tried to convince Britain of the required adjustments to the Iraqi-Kuwaiti border and the annexing of the

islands of Werba and Bobiyan, to ensure that the Basra and Khour Abdullah shores were within Iraqi territory. As far back as 1973, Iraq proposed the division of Bobiyan Island vertically into two parts, the east belonging to Iraq and the west belonging to Kuwait. But its efforts failed (Lauterpacht, 1991: 75, 77). Hussein was convinced Iraq needed a waterway which curved around the two islands back to Iraq's port of Umm Qasr to ensure Iraq strategic access to the Arab Gulf region, and to enable it to develop a deepwater navy and port for its oil exports (Sciolino, 1991: 192).

3.2.3. Allegations of Illegal Extraction of Oil by Kuwait

Hussein claimed that Kuwait was illegally extracting oil (allegedly about 2.5 billion barrels) from oil fields along the Iraqi-Kuwaiti border, and insisted this resulted in a loss of revenue for Iraq (Venter, 2004: 92). These allegations surfaced when the Arab League established the Military Patrol Line between Iraq and Kuwait in 1962 after Kuwait moved its drilling rigs into the buffer zone in the 1970s and 1980s to establish drilling sites (Issa, 2008: 3). Since the 1980s, allegations surfaced that the Sheikhs of Kuwait attempted to change the state of the adjacent boundary by building guard points, constructing defense screens and digging petrol wells to exploit Remelah, an Iraqi oil field. It was noted that Kuwait had moved customs and passport control points to Al Abdelli, in the north and close to the Iraqi terrain as part of plans to extract oil from Iraqi wells (Lauterpacht, 1991: 77).

3.2.4. Kuwait's Intention to Raise its Oil Production Quota

Prior to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, Kuwait allegedly intended to demand raising its oil production quota at an OPEC meeting in October 1990. For Kuwait, raising the production quota would ensure that the surplus in the market would keep the oil prices low. Hussein accused Kuwait and the UAE of exceeding their quotas of oil production decided by OPEC and flooding the market, resulting in a drop in oil prices (American Patriot Friends Network, 2004: 2). Iraq believed that Kuwait intended to jeopardise Iraq economically and threatened Kuwait to desist from exceeding its oil quota and from selling its oil at cheap prices. Kuwait, however, refused to

change its oil prices and Iraq believed that this was part of a US-Israeli plan to destabilise Iraq politically and economically (Lauterpacht, 1991: 74).

In keeping with the above, it can be argued that many of the reasons why Iraq invaded Kuwait, were related to the supply of, and the pricing of oil. For the US, it would have been important to maintain stability in the supply and price of oil.

The next section will briefly discuss the developments that led to the 1991 Gulf War, as well as the declared and undeclared reasons for the US-led invasion of Iraq in 1991. These reasons will illustrate how several unresolved issues that the US had with Iraq, filtered into the decision making process that eventually culminated in the 2003 war on Iraq.

4. THE INVASION OF IRAQ: 1991

Although the US cited three main reasons for its 2003 war, which include Iraq's alleged WMD; Iraq's alleged links to Al Qaeda, and the promotion of democracy, it is argued that there were undeclared reasons for the war. These allegedly include the US interest in the region's oil; ensuring the continued security of Israel; increasing US military presence in the region, and preventing the emergence of a regional power which could threaten US interests. These reasons can be considered to have already originated in US planning prior to the beginning of the First Gulf War. This section will discuss the events leading up to the 1991 Gulf War, and why the US perceived Iraq's invasion of Kuwait as a threat, as well as elaborating on the declared and undeclared reasons that propelled the US to intervene.

4.1. Background to the 1991 Gulf War

On 12 August 1990, Hussein proposed a peace plan in exchange for his withdrawal from Kuwait, which included the unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from Palestinian territories, Syria and Lebanon; the withdrawal of Syria from Lebanon, and of Iranian troops from Iraqi territory, as well as Iraqi control of the Gulf Islands and the Rumailia oil field. The US rejected this since Hussein linked regional issues as a pre-condition for the withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait

(Sciolino, 1991: 228). Subsequently, Iraq proposed that it would withdraw with a US pledge not to attack Iraq; foreign forces leaving the region; the Palestinian problem being settled by the UNSC, and the disputed islands being left for future consideration. The US however demanded Iraq's unconditional withdrawal to avert war (Chomsky, 1991: 16).

The US began offensive military planning in September and October 1990 and on 8 November 1990 (as part of that strategy), President George Bush senior announced the beginning of US deployments to Saudi Arabia to ensure an offensive military option (Sciolino, 1991: 236, 237). On 29 November 1990, the UNSC passed Resolution 678 authorising the use of force against Iraq if it did not withdraw from Kuwait by 15 January 1991 (UN Security Council, 1990). This resolution was important for the US since the US Congress would not oppose the use of force after the UN had already approved it. On 14 January 1991, France, in a last attempt to avert war, proposed that the UNSC call for a rapid and massive withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait and that member states contribute to the resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict and the Palestinian crisis (Chomsky, 1991: 16). The US and the UK, however, vetoed the proposal fearing that it would prevent the option of war against Iraq and split the 28 member coalition allied against Iraq. They also believed that had sanctions been given a chance, some allies would discontinue their tacit support for the war (Sciolino, 1991: 25, 233).

On 12 January 1991, Congress authorised the use of force and on 15 January 1991, Bush issued an order authorising military force against Iraq (US George Bush Presidential Library, 1991a). On 16 January the air raid on Iraq began, and on 23 February the coalition forces launched their offensive (Brody, 1994: 221, 222). Iraq was ill-equipped to counter the allied offensive and responded by firing several missiles at Israel in the hope that the latter would retaliate and disrupt the war. Analysts argue that due to the speed and precision of the invasion, Hussein decided to withdraw from Kuwait. On 28 February 1991, Iraq asked for a ceasefire (Tripp, 2002: 254).

Subsequently, the UNSC called on Iraq to acknowledge the formal independent status of Kuwait; to pay war reparations, and to allow UN inspections to investigate Iraq's biological, chemical and nuclear weapons programme. On 3 April 1991, the Security Council passed Resolution 687, which created the UNSCOM and required Iraq to destroy under international supervision its

chemical, biological weapons and missiles with a range greater than 150 kilometers and their associated programmes, stocks, components, research and facilities (Iraq Survey Group, 2004b: 4). After many years, UNSCOM concluded that Iraq worked on several systems such as cluster bombs, 122 mm rocket warheads, LD-250 aerial bombs and 350 mm and 1,000 mm caliber superguns (Tripp, 2002: 260). In December 1996, the UN implemented the Oil for Food (OFF) Programme, which authorised Iraq to export unlimited quantities of oil to finance humanitarian needs and to improve economic conditions for ordinary Iraqi's. Hussein manipulated the exports and diverted this income to his key supporters (Venter, 2004: 64). Under the programme, Iraq became a major exporter of oil and in 2001-02, produced some 2.8 million barrels of oil per day (mbd) and exported some 1.7 millions barrels per day, earning it approximately US \$ 12 billion in 2001-02. A fixed percentage was used to pay reparations to the Kuwaiti government and to pay for UN expenses. The rest was used for imports. Iraq's acceptance of the OFF Programme in May 1996 and its expulsion of weapons inspectors, led to increased activity in delivery systems development. Hussein's growing oil reserves enabled him access to dual use items and materials for military research and development projects, as well as to develop an underground network of trade intermediaries, front companies and international suppliers willing to trade oil for hard currency for conventional weapons (Iraq Survey Group, 2004a: 34, 35 & 2004b, 5).

Some analysts argue that sanctions strengthened Hussein's position and his networks of patronage and that this, as well as the abrupt end of UN weapons inspections in 1998, provided him with an opportunity to covertly strengthen his military and conduct possible nuclear weapons research (Tripp, 2002: 279). From 1999 to 2001, Hussein attempted to use Iraqi oil resources to leverage the international community into ending sanctions against Iraq. Iraq often reduced or suspended oil production and exports to increase upward pressure on world oil prices to influence decision making in the UNSC. It also controlled the contracting process for selling its oil and arranging purchases of humanitarian goods. Moreover, to gain support, Iraq approached Russian, Chinese and French energy firms and made them recipients of oil contracts in exchange for their country's support in the UNSC. It seems that Hussein's manipulation of the OFF Programme, may have formed part of the reasons for the Second Gulf War in 2003 (Iraq Survey Group, 2004a: 34).

In 1998, Iraq refused UN weapons inspectors entry into the country. Consequently the UNSC passed Resolutions 1194 and 1205 of 9 September and 5 November 1998 respectively, condemning Iraq's decision to halt co-operation with UNSCOM (Iraq Survey Group, 2004a: 44). In 1999, the UNSC adopted Resolution 1284 to re-establish a weapons inspection regime in Iraq. UNSCOM was replaced by the UN Monitoring, Inspection and Verification Commission (UNMOVIC) (UN Security Council, 1999). However, Iraq again refused weapons inspectors entry (Tripp, 2002: 179, 280). With the election of President George Bush junior in 2001, he ordered air strikes against anti-aircraft sites near Baghdad to protect allied aircraft patrolling Iraqi airspace, and this proved that Iraq had rebuilt its air defense installations under sanctions. Later Bush proposed an overhaul of the sanctions focusing on military related imports and exports as well as on developing consensus in the UN Security Council to authorise UNMOVIC to resume its work (Tripp, 2002: 282). These measures were unsuccessful and some US Administration officials believed that the only solution to the perceived Iraqi threat was to overthrow Saddam Hussein. The policy was, however, only articulated after the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks on the US homeland (Hallenberg, 2005: 2, 24).

The following section focuses on the declared and undeclared reasons for the US intervention in the First Gulf War, since the reasons for the two Gulf Wars are related.

4.2. The Declared and Undeclared Reasons for the US Intervention in the 1991 Gulf War

Overall, it has been suggested that Iraq's invasion of Kuwait provided a suitable context for the achievement of US policy in the region and that the US had various declared and undeclared reasons when it decided to intervene. The 1991 Gulf War contradicted past US policy towards Iraq, since the US did not consider Iraq a threat when the latter invaded Iran but a threat to US interests when Iraq invaded Kuwait (Dorman & Livingston, 1994: 66, 67). In 1988 and in 1990, successive US Administrations succeeded in convincing the US Senate not to curtail aid to Iraq after moves were proposed in Congress to impose sanctions on Iraq for its use of chemical weapons against Kurdish civilians in 1988. The US agricultural and oil industry protested against such sanctions and, moreover, the US argued that sanctions would limit its flexibility to modify

Iraq's policies (Sciolino, 2002: 171, 176). This demonstrates how US political and strategic interests have dictated its policy towards Iraq and the region.

It can be argued that the declared reasons for the 1991 invasion of Iraq were partly domestic, international and Middle Eastern in nature. According to Yousif (1991: 66), the domestic reasons stemmed from the US need to save the oil producing states from bankruptcy by raising OPEC oil prices; boosting the US military-industrial complex following the end of the Cold War; boosting the US economy to save it from recession through large-scale military operations, and targeting another "tyrant" following the negative image associated with the US after the Vietnam war. On the international front, the war was allegedly fought to protect American military presence in the Gulf; to dominate the Middle East; maintain stability in the supply and price of oil, and to ensure the security of Israel (Williams, 2003:36). This section will discuss the declared reasons for the 1991 war on Iraq, which include namely to destroy Iraq's WMD capabilities and programmes; to contain Iraq, and to liberate Kuwait. The undeclared reasons for the war will also be discussed, namely the US interest in the stability of the supply and price of oil, and to ensure the security of, and prevent any threats to Israel.

4.2.1. The Declared Reasons for the 1991 Gulf War

The main declared reason for US involvement in the 1991 Gulf War was to liberate Kuwait. This section will mainly discuss the declared reasons for US involvement in the 1991 Gulf War which includes Iraq's alleged WMD and the US aim to destroy Iraq's military capability and to contain Iraq's regional ambitions.

4.2.1.1. The Liberation of Kuwait and Containing Iraq's Regional Ambitions

The primary declared reason for US involvement in the 1991 War was to liberate Kuwait and to prevent Iraq from realising its ambitions of dominating the region and from asserting itself as the main player in dictating the region's oil price and policies. On 30 August 1990, Bush delivered a news conference on US efforts to reverse the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. He referred to the various UNSC resolutions and stated that US goals for its intervention in the crisis were to ensure the

immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait; to restore Kuwait's legitimate government; to ensure the stability of Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf; as well as to protect US citizens (US George Bush Presidential Library, 1990a).

Critics have argued that had Hussein only invaded Kuwait at the borders and limited the invasion to a territorial dispute, the international community may not have seen reason to invade Iraq. But since Kuwait is a significant source of oil in the Middle East, the US and Western states were not prepared to lose a vital source of oil supplies (American Patriot Friends Network, 2004: 1, 3). Furthermore, it has been alluded that Iraq deployed its forces on the Saudi border (the largest supplier of oil in the world), and the US perceived this as a declaration of Hussein's expansionist intentions (Sciolino, 1991: 14). Bush's address to the Joint Session of the US Congress on the crisis, reiterated the US objective of ensuring Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait and that Saddam Hussein posed a threat to vital economic interests in the region (US George Bush Presidential Library, 1990b).

Since the 1950s, Iraq believed it should play a primary role in Arab politics. Before the rise of Iraq's Ba'ath party, Iraqi nationalism inspired regional ambitions in the Iraqi leadership. Iraq envisioned an Arab revolution in which all regimes would be replaced with a popular socialist Arab nation. But after coming to power in 1968, the Ba'ath Party failed to convince other Arab regimes of the Arab revolution. Consequently, Iraq antagonised those governments by supporting underground insurgent groups (Sciolino, 1991: 129). After the death of Egypt's King Nasser in 1970, who espoused Arab Nationalism, a leadership vacuum arose in the Arab world and since 1978, Hussein was determined to fill the gap and project Iraq as a militarily powerful and politically stable country in the region (Tripp, 2001: 231). Hussein believed that it was important to assert himself as a leader in order to contain the Iranian threat; to reaffirm his dedication to the Arab cause; to place him in a position of defender of the Arab Gulf states, and increase trust between Iraq and Kuwait in the hope of leading to a territorial settlement. Since the 1980s, Hussein openly rejected superpower military presence in the region and demanded that Arab states reject the presence of foreign armies and bases on Arab homeland (Sciolino, 1991: 107, 133). Iraq's aspirations of Arab unity and intervention in the Persian Gulf, and US concerns that Iraq could try dominate the region and threaten Western interests (oil resources), were

emphasised in Bush's address to the nation on 29 January 1991 (US George Bush Presidential Library, 1991c).

4.2.1.2. Iraq's Nuclear, Chemical and Biological Weapons Programme

US concerns regarding Iraq's weapon capabilities and its nuclear weapons programmes were highlighted in several speeches and addresses to Congress by Bush senior. The US believed that if Iraq were allowed to defeat Kuwait, Iraq would have gained economic and military power, which would have enabled it to coerce its neighbours and to gain control of the region's oil reserves (US George Bush Presidential Library, 1990b). Two days after the inception of the war, Bush stated that Hussein had devoted significant resources over a decade in building up Iraq's military capability (US George Bush Presidential Library, 1991b).

Since the 1970s, Iraq sought to acquire long range weapons delivery capability. By 1991, Iraq purchased missiles and infrastructure that formed the foundation of Iraq's future missile system development (Iraq Survey Group, 2004b: 3). During the Iraq-Iran war, Iraq managed to accumulate weapons and various other technologies, largely financed by loans from Western powers, namely Russia, the US, China, France and Brazil, and it also acquired uranium from Niger, Brazil and Portugal (Sciolino, 1991: 141, 142). These purchases were later exposed in the aftermath of Iraq's invasion of Kuwait and some of the above mentioned countries later condemned Iraq in the UN. By 1991, Iraq was able to modify some of its delivery systems to increase their range and to develop WMD dissemination options. However, it failed to acquire long range delivery systems to replace those exhausted during the war with Iran. This drove Iraq to develop its own indigenous delivery system production capability. The Iraq Survey Group (ISG) report confirms, however, that Operation Desert Storm and subsequent UN Resolutions and weapons inspections brought these delivery systems programmes to a halt, eliminating its long range missile inventory and production infrastructure (Iraq Survey Group, 2004b: 4).

The UNSCOM inspections indicated that Iraq possessed chemical weapons; that it was able to adapt biological organisms, and that it was in the process of developing a nuclear weapon. Iraqi authorities denied the existence of any chemical, biological and nuclear programmes, obstructed

the teams on several occasions from investigations during undeclared visits to certain sites and at times expelled the US experts from Iraq (Tripp 2002: 260). UNSCOM was aware that the Iraqi authorities could have removed suspect materials and evidence from production plants and other designated sites (Venter, 2004: 99). Nevertheless, UNSCOM did make some findings. Although Hussein declared thirty tons of biological warfare agents, UNSCOM confirmed that the Al Hakam plant was central to Iraq's biological weapons programme and that it produced about twenty thousand liters of botulinum toxin between 1989 and 1990 (Venter, 2004: 147 - 149). UNSCOM also confirmed that Iraq was involved in clandestine biological and chemical weapons production; observed a discrepancy between Iraq's disclosed nuclear and biological related items to those actually recovered, and confirmed that Iraq managed to weaponise bacterial agents, despite Iraq's claims that it unilaterally destroyed its biological and chemical agents (Cirincione *et al*, 2004: 35). Therefore UNSCOM concluded that Iraq was developing a biological, chemical and nuclear programme.

After the allied bombing, Bush announced the coalition was successful in bombing all of Iraq's nuclear, chemical and biological sites, but there was still much speculation whether Hussein managed to salvage some uranium and whether all sites were destroyed (Sciolino, 1991: 154). In 1996 through to 1998, the IAEA and UNSCOM confirmed that Iraq possessed components for nuclear weapons but that it lacked enriched uranium (Venter, 2004: 125). Hussein denied this. However, it has been alluded that he could have destroyed and secretly exported some sensitive items. Moreover, Iraq refused to submit a detailed report on its non-conventional weapons programme (Venter, 2004: 103, 105).

From the above, it can be argued that the question of Iraq's alleged WMD programmes remained largely unresolved since the First Gulf War. Irrespective of this, the US has maintained its interest in oil in the region as well as its commitment to Israel to ensure its security in the region. Although there may have been many reasons for the US invasion of Iraq in 1991, (key being the liberation of Kuwait), the central undeclared reasons may have been oil and to prevent Hussein from achieving dominance over the region's resources. Some have alluded that the 1991 war served to prevent the emergence of a threat to US interests in the Middle East as well as to ensure continued instability in the region, which could necessitate US military intervention in the

future in order to secure US oil interests and to ensure Israel's security (Selfa, 1999: 4). The 1991 war may also have served in part, to prevent any resolution of the Israeli/Palestinian conflict. In this context, the next section will discuss the alleged undeclared reasons for the 1991 Gulf War.

4.2.2. The Undeclared Reasons for the 1991 Gulf War

The undeclared reasons for the 1991 Gulf War allegedly included US interests in securing oil in the region and US interests in securing Israel's security. It has been argued that these undeclared reasons were also discussed in US foreign policy circles prior to the US decision to invade Iraq in 2003. It is also argued that the US has maintained its undeclared interests in the region since the end of the 1991 war with Iraq.

4.2.2.1. Securing Oil and Maintaining the Stability and Price of Oil

Critics of US foreign policy have argued that US intervention in the 1991 Gulf War was motivated by its interest to secure its dominance in the Middle East region. The Middle East has always been of interest to the US given its oil reserves and the importance of the Suez Canal. By having dominance in the Middle East, the US could control Gulf oil from where 90 per cent of Japan's oil supplies originate (Yousif, 1991: 66). Largely, US involvement in the region has been premised on a need (especially following the beginning of the Cold War) to deny the region and its resources to the Soviet Union. Now, US involvement in the region appears to serve as a countermeasure to other emerging economic powers such as China, who are also competing for oil (D'Amato, 2001: 3, 9).

The US has seemingly used the pretext of promoting democracy and eliminating dictators in order to justify its intervention in the internal politics of Arab states (Yousif, 1991: 66). Therefore it could be argued that US intervention in politically unstable Gulf States was aimed at containing the political crisis in these countries, since regional and domestic pressures have been exerted to use oil as a means of confronting Israel and since any political disturbance could negatively affect oil production and oil pricing (Gause, 1994: 181, 182). Feldman (2004: 17)

argues that US foreign policy has been dualistic, since the US has supported repressive governments in the Middle East to ensure their continued support of US interests and to contain terrorism, but also to maintain a cheap supply of oil. This seems to suggest that US national interests outweigh the domestic issues in such countries.

The US may have also initially perceived its involvement in the First Gulf War as a way to prevent a possible invasion of Saudi Arabia and to protect Saudi oil production and transportation (Freeman, 1991: 173). Saudi Arabia is the largest producer of crude oil and cannot be disrupted given the high demand for oil. Short term disruptions will impact on world oil markets if demand from emerging economic powers increases and if other producers outside the Gulf do not invest more in production capacity (Gause, 1994: 178).

Many critics assert that the US-led war with Iraq in 1991 was to prevent Hussein from influencing other Gulf States to change the US dollar oil transaction currency into an alternative currency, and to ensure that the US maintains the monopoly currency for the international oil market. Any effort to denominate the world price of oil to an alternative currency would expose the US to currency fluctuations on energy imports. Had Hussein achieved this, the cost of US energy imports would increase as this would imply a devaluation of the dollar to the euro or an alternative currency. But since some Gulf States are dependent upon the US for their security, they have been reluctant to change the currency (Gause, 1994: 181).

The Gulf remains the largest reservoir of oil in the world, and the US requires oil to sustain its economy and industrial complex. Having identified oil as a critical resource for the US, it is argued that the Middle East region has, and is important for the US, in terms of securing sources of oil and maintaining a stable oil supply (Chomsky, 1991: 24). There is a general opinion that US policy in the region is allegedly dictated by US oil needs and since some Gulf States oppose US political and economic agendas, oil is likely to be used as the key instrument in the confrontations between the West and the Gulf. Nevertheless, since oil reserves in other parts of the globe are limited, the US could implement policies in order to secure access to oil, namely through political and economic pressure (Gause, 1994: 178).

4.2.2.2. Preventing an Iraqi threat to Israel's Regional Power

In some views, a compelling motive for the US involvement in the 1991 Gulf War was to protect and secure Israel's interests related to security in the region and in containing Hussein's quest for regional dominance. The Israel factor has long been considered part of the explanation for US intervention in the Middle East (Yousif, 1991: 66). In this respect, US interests were to limit Iraq's military strength and jeopardise its future potential for emerging as a regional power. It has been argued that the 1991 war on Iraq was largely to secure a continuous supply of oil to the US at good market prices as well as to ensure Israel's continued security (D'Amato, 2001: 2, 4). Since Iraq linked the existence of Israel to US support and intervention in the region, Israel's withdrawal from the occupied Palestinian territories formed part of Hussein's conditions for his withdrawal from Kuwait. Even prior to the Kuwait war, when the US and Iraq were on cordial terms, Hussein proposed that he would eliminate his chemical and biological weapons if Israel met his action by eliminating its nuclear arsenal. The US rejected this proposal since it did not want to acknowledge the support it provided to Israel, and also, it did not want to link Hussein's proposal to regional issues (Chomsky, 1991: 22).

It has been argued that US foreign aid to the Middle East and to Israel has been a function of US national security interests in the region. The US has asserted that its policy seeks to promote stability in the region. Foreign aid has often been used as leverage to encourage peace between Israel and its neighbours whilst strengthening bilateral relations between the US and Israel and moderate Arab governments. Nevertheless, it can be argued that US foreign aid has contributed significantly to Israel's security (Sharp, 15 June 2010: 1).

The fact that the US supplies Israel with weapons has angered many Gulf States and created anti-US sentiment and opposition to US foreign policy and intervention in the region. Without any US military power in the region, another Gulf state could possibly assert its dominance and challenge Israel. Israel has demonstrated its predisposition to pre-empt regional threats through forceful policies against Palestine and Lebanon, which have triggered strong opposition from Gulf States (D'Amato, 2001: 5). US arms sales to some countries in the region, namely Saudi Arabia and Jordan, have been opposed in view of the negative repercussions it has for regional

stability. Regional arms sales should also be seen in a wider context of expanding US military presence and power in the region. Arms sales to Israel have effectively enabled the US to indirectly re-position its military equipment, which, if required at a time of military intervention, could easily be deployed (Gause, 1994: 188).

Gause (1994: 179, 180) argues that Middle Eastern political pressures on oil related issues in the Gulf States are inextricably linked to the Arab/Israeli conflict and to the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians. Most Arab countries were strongly opposed to Israel's expansionist policies in the region and condemned US support of Israel, and its past lack of political will to support a two state solution.

Some have argued that Hussein's invasion of Kuwait had a superficial link to the Palestinian cause and that this rhetoric was used to articulate a belligerent stance against Israel. Arab countries perceived the war on Kuwait mostly as strategic posturing by Hussein to dominate the region (Yousif, 1991: 56). He used the issue since the Arab/Israeli war in 1973, to discourage Arab states from co-operating with the West, especially with those that supported Israel. Some sources allude that Hussein rewarded Palestinian suicide bombers with incentives to bomb Israeli targets and this is indicative of how he used the Palestinian issue as a pretext for his hostility towards Israel (Venter, 1994: 80).

For years the US supported the Israeli peace plan, which opposed the creation of a Palestinian state and Palestinian self-determination (Chomsky, 1991: 21). The invasion of Kuwait forced the US to react to Hussein's propaganda campaign, and to confront the underlying issues of the Middle East by way of peace talks between Palestine and Israel (Harrison, 1993: 3). The US is now committed to the two state solution and will promote the resolution of the Israeli/Palestinian crisis as part of its strategy of renewing relations with the Muslim community (US Whitehouse, 2009).

From the above discussion, it is argued that the US had declared and undeclared reasons for spearheading the coalition forces into the 1991 Iraq war. The US was not as strongly criticised for its involvement in the First Gulf War as it was for its involvement in the Second Gulf War,

inter alia due to the alleged unproven claims the US put forward for intervention in the latter case. Nevertheless, it is argued that the declared and undeclared reasons for the US 1991 war with Iraq spilled over into the Second Gulf War, namely eliminating Iraq's alleged weapons and nuclear capability; securing the state of Israel; establishing greater US military presence in the region, and US interests in the region's strategic resources.

5. CONCLUSION

The US-led intervention in the First Gulf War in 1991 was spurred by Iraq's 1990 invasion of Kuwait. Iraq committed aggression against Kuwait and posed a danger to the security of the Gulf States. Although the US-led intervention in the First Gulf War can be based on UNSC Resolution 678 of 29 November 1990, justified by the necessity to liberate Kuwait, it is argued that the US intended to contain Iraq through its intervention as well as to secure other interests in the region (American Patriot Friends Network, 2004: 1, 3). Since the 1980 war with Iran and the 1990 invasion of Kuwait, Iraq had ambitions to become a regional dominant power and to project influence internationally. Hussein's desire to further industrialise and militarise Iraq raised concerns amongst the Western powers since he advocated his nuclear weapon development plans. Although Operation Desert Storm destroyed most of Iraq's weapons facilities, there was always uncertainty whether Iraq had managed to salvage some of its weapons systems. For Hussein, nuclear weapons would ensure Iraq's survival in the face of possible confrontation by certain regional neighbours, namely Iran and Israel, and would have enabled Iraq to establish a strategic balance between the Arabs and Israel. Iraq saw Israel as a threat to Arab interests and a clear rival since it is a nuclear power. Although Hussein did not perceive the US as a natural adversary like he did Iran and Israel, he did portray the US and Israel as inseparable (Iraq Survey Group, 2004b: 28 – 31).

Initially, the US did not plan to overthrow Hussein but rather to contain his ambitions (Hallenberg, 2005: 24). Hussein used chemical weapons against Kurdish civilians and his policies were considered unpredictable. He had ambitions to assert Iraq as a regional power, and therefore the US perceived this as a threat to US dominance and power in the region (Tripp, 2002: 283, 284).

Analysts argue that the US intervention in the First Gulf War was also about ensuring the stability of oil prices and the oil transaction dollar currency, and to ensure that prices were within the range of the world market (Gause, 1994: 181, 182). Hussein allegedly wanted to convert the oil currency into the euro and this would have been contrary to US interests and the stability of the dollar on world markets. The 1991 war was allegedly about ensuring that Iraq would not pose a threat to the oil market and disrupt the flow of oil to the West. It was also alleged that the US intended to ensure that surplus oil did not accumulate in the Middle East, but rather that this surplus went to the West including the UK, to ensure the continued economic viability of Western Europe and the US (Chomsky, 1991: 25).

On 29 January 2002, President Bush delivered a State of the Union address in which he included Iraq in the “axis of evil” and cited the danger of WMD. On 12 September 2002, he emphasised the threat of Iraq’s alleged WMD, and that Iraq posed a threat to global peace and security (US Whitehouse, 2002b). In view of the concerns that Bush’s speech evoked, the UNSC passed Resolution 1441 on 8 November 2002, which found Iraq in material breach of all its obligations under the relevant UN resolutions (UN Security Council: 2002). Iraq eventually succumbed to Resolution 1441 in the hope to avoid provoking the US. Subsequently, in November 2002, UN weapons inspections resumed in Iraq. Nevertheless, the US was not convinced that Iraq abandoned its WMD programmes, and consequently began preparing to justify its war plans against Iraq.

With the foregoing as background, Chapter Four will discuss the declared US reasons for the 2003 invasion of Iraq. Considering that Iraq’s weapons programmes have been a contentious issue since its invasion of Kuwait, the issue of Iraq’s alleged WMD will specifically be explored in more detail.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE DECLARED REASONS FOR THE SECOND GULF WAR

1. INTRODUCTION

The September 11th 2001 terrorist attacks (9/11) in the US prompted the October 2001 war against Afghanistan, as well as a radical shift in US foreign policy towards a more expansive and global strategy to defend the US homeland and its national interests. It has also been widely argued that the 9/11 terrorist attacks provided a contextual background for the 2003 Second Gulf War (Kagan, 2008: 30, 33). The 2003 US-led war against Iraq, was perceived by critics as an extension of US imperialism into the Middle East (Williams, 2003: 18). Some UN member states opposed the 2003 war since there was no credible evidence supporting US claims of alleged Iraqi WMD. Critics argued that the US used the September 11th attacks and the 2002 US National Security Strategy to justify war on Iraq and remove Saddam Hussein from power, which in the US view, would pave the way for radical transformation in the Middle East (Klare: 2003: 7, 10).

This chapter will discuss the US decision to invade Iraq within the context of the 9/11 terror attacks, as well as the US “war on terror”. It will also briefly mention the September 2002 National Security Strategy of the US which may have influenced the official US policy on Iraq. The chapter will mainly discuss the three officially declared reasons for the war, namely Iraq’s alleged WMD; its alleged links to Al Qaeda, and the promotion of democracy in Iraq, as well as the intelligence failures that occurred relating to the two main declared reasons namely Iraq’s alleged WMD, and its alleged links to Al Qaeda.

An official assessment of the credibility of the declared reasons (following the end of the conventional war) by the US and UK governments and by the UN, namely the IAEA and the UNMOVIC, as well as some unofficial assessments will also be provided.

2. US POLICY BACKGROUND PRIOR TO THE SECOND GULF WAR

During the First Gulf War, Hussein revealed aggressive regional ambitions with his invasion of Kuwait. He considered WMD as an integral element to advance his ambitions towards regional domination and to ensure Iraq's national security (Iraq Survey Group, 2004a, 24). The rationale for Iraq's WMD programmes was to deter Israel's WMD capabilities and weaken its position, (thereby weaken US leverage in the region), as well as to counter any threat from Islamic Iran (UNMOVIC, 2003d: 5).

Against the background of the 9/11 incidents in the US and Iraq's unresolved disarmament issues following the end of UN weapons inspections in 1998, a sense of concern developed in the international community that Iraq's conventional weapons and WMD programmes may have been regenerated since the time Iraq expelled UN weapons inspectors in 1998. The experience of the First Gulf War seemingly cemented Western perceptions that Iraq had strong desires to obtain WMD (Venter, 2004: 24).

In the lead up to the 2003 Iraq war, Bush reiterated that Iraq posed a threat to US national security (US Whitehouse, 2003c). Having failed to provide evidence of Iraq's alleged WMD and its alleged links to Al Qaeda, the US put forward the promotion of democracy in Iraq as another reason, before the outbreak of the war (Singer, 2005: 9).

This section will introduce the context of the 9/11 incident as well as briefly discuss the September 2002 US National Security Strategy (adopted a year after 9/11), which may have influenced the official US policy position on Iraq as well as the US policy on WMD proliferation. The three declared reasons for the 2003 war will also be addressed and in view of the fact that the US and UK intelligence communities were criticised for failing to produce convincing evidence for the war, intelligence failures will be incorporated into the discussion on Iraq's alleged WMD and links to Al Qaeda.

2.1. The 11 September 2001 Terrorist Attacks

Although the US is the preeminent military, political and economic power in the world, the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks indicated certain vulnerabilities. However, the October 2001 US invasion of Afghanistan and the March 2003 US-led invasion of Iraq, also indicated US global dominance and military power. The combination of US vulnerability and US superiority reinforced the US tendency towards unilateralism in the promotion of its foreign policies and national interests (Macfarlane, 2004: 52). The 9/11 incidents had a profound impact since security and international terrorism became a global concern, and since the attacks provided the US with a platform to retaliate against its enemies.

The international sympathy that emerged for the casualties suffered as a result of the 9/11 incidents, enabled the US to muster support for its invasion of Afghanistan and later mobilise a coalition for the war against Iraq (Huldt, 2005: 42, 43). The attacks were catalytic since they reinforced US perceptions of its own insecurity, and its relations with the Muslim world and the Middle East. Important issues that preceded the 9/11 incidents, namely US bilateral relationships with some Muslim countries, receded in importance and co-operation on the global war on terror assumed a preeminent position (Singer, 2005: 1, 3).

This sub-section will briefly discuss the US foreign policy on terrorism and on the proliferation of WMD, following the 9/11 incidents, and mention the key policy documents that the US adopted reflecting its position. It will also mention how critics have generally perceived the US policy on terrorism after the 9/11 incidents.

Following the 9/11 incident, the US adopted a strategy of pre-emptive self-defence to ensure the security of its homeland and to deter possible future terrorist attacks (Kagan, 2008: 30). Bush's 28 January 2002, State of the Union address emphasised the "axis of evil" countries and the US position on combating terrorism, which was adopted as the US official policy against terrorist organisations and the "axis of evil" countries (US Whitehouse, 2002a). In line with the above, the October 2002 US National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) asserted that Iraq continued its WMD programs in defiance of UN resolutions and restrictions and that it possessed chemical and

biological weapons as well as missiles with ranges in excess of UN restrictions (US CIA, 2002). The US 2002 State of the Union address and the 2002 NIE estimate later formed the basis for the US claims against Iraq.

To address the rising security risks, the Administration established the Federal Department of Homeland Security and adopted the US Patriot Act of 2001 which aimed to “deter and punish terrorist acts in the United States and around the world, to enhance law enforcement investigatory tools and for other purposes” (US Congress, 2001). To investigate the circumstances surrounding 9/11, the US also created the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks on the United States (US Congress, 2002).

Some analysts argued that the 9/11 attacks provided a contextual background against which the decision to invade Iraq was made. Some, however, argued that even if 9/11 had not occurred, the US would have continued to pressure Iraq through the UNSC and the sanctions regime. (Huldt, 2005: 45) Others again suggested that the war would have taken place at any rate, since war with Iraq and ousting Hussein existed as a policy option following Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait (Hallenberg, 2005: 24). The 9/11 incidents reinforced the threat of WMD and demonstrated US vulnerability to any attack from within and from outside its borders. Given Iraq's previous connections to terrorist networks and its WMD programmes, the US linked the war on terrorism to Iraq and highlighted the dangers of WMD proliferation and the acquisition of WMD by terrorists (Williams, 2003: 21).

It may be argued that the 9/11 incidents forced the US to build a case of impending threats, starting with the war against Afghanistan and Bush’s strategy of pre-emption. The US has been preoccupied with Iraq since the First Gulf War and therefore it is argued that 9/11 facilitated the shift from a more complacent US strategy to a more offensive strategy (Brunn, 2004: 38, 144).

In line with the above and against the background of the 9/11 incidents, the next sub-section will briefly discuss the September 2002 US National Security Strategy.

2.2. The 2002 US National Security Strategy

The 2002 US National Security Strategy (US National Security Council, 2002: 5, 6) placed less emphasis on concepts of deterrence and traditional approaches to non-proliferation. The document emphasised the importance of a pre-emptive strategy against hostile states and terrorist groups and stated that the most fundamental commitment to the US homeland is to defend the US from its enemies. It identified radical terrorists and rogue states as the primary threats to US security and stated that the US should use every means available to hinder terrorist financing and organisation. Moreover, the strategy indirectly cited Iraq as a US adversary, although it did not suggest that it possessed WMD.

Some have argued that the case for war against Iraq was made in the context of this strategic doctrine since it posited the right of, and necessity for the US to pursue the unilateral and pre-emptive military force against rogue regimes seeking or possessing WMD (Powers, 2002: 3). The doctrine placed a priority on maintaining US military dominance in the world and its overall tone suggested that the US did not consider that traditional concepts of deterrence and traditional limits on the pre-emptive use of force were adequate to address the global challenge of terrorism or states seeking to acquire WMD.

With regard to WMD, the strategy categorically states that in order to counter the threat of WMD, the US will identify and destroy any terrorist threat before the US is threatened with WMD (US National Security Council, 2002: 14, 15). Furthermore, underlying the strategy is a moral dimension which the US emphasised; namely that it has a moral imperative to address the Iraqi threat and similar threats. Therefore it can be argued that the US believed it had a moral obligation to defend against terrorism and the perceived Iraqi threat (Powers, 2002: 4). Largely, the strategy document seemingly suggests that US foreign policy is often guided by military intervention.

The following section will discuss the officially declared reasons for the 2003 US-led war against Iraq.

3. THE OFFICIAL DECLARED REASONS FOR THE IRAQ WAR AND INTELLIGENCE FAILURES

In the lead up to the 2003 Second Gulf war, Bush cited Iraq's alleged WMD programmes and its alleged links to the Al Qaeda terrorist network and argued for a war of pre-emptive self defence (US Whitehouse, 2003a). The US cited the above mentioned claims as the official reasons for the war. As finding credible evidence on these reasons appeared remote, the US stated that the third reason for the war was to promote democracy in Iraq. In line with the above and in the context of official US statements, this section will discuss the three officially declared reasons for the US-led war, as well as provide an analysis of each reason. In view of the fact that the main reasons for the war were not supported by credible evidence, this section will also incorporate intelligence failures with respect to Iraq's alleged WMD and its alleged links to Al Qaeda.

3.1. Iraq's Alleged Weapons of Mass Destruction

In keeping with the first declared reason put forward by the US for its war on Iraq, namely Iraq's alleged WMD, this section will briefly discuss US lobbying efforts in trying to persuade the UN and the international community of a need for military action against Iraq. It will also provide an analysis of the declared reason as well as mention the key findings of the ISG, the IAEA and UNMOVIC on Iraq's alleged WMD. Lastly the section will discuss how intelligence gathering failed in producing a solid case for the war.

3.1.1. Building the Case for the War: Iraq's Alleged WMD

Despite US claims that Iraq possessed WMD, no evidence was found suggesting that it did. Critics argued that this declared reason was a pretext for a war that served other agendas. In the aftermath of the 1991 Gulf War, and the subsequent inspections regimen, Iraq's declared WMD, delivery systems and its capability for its WMD programmes were destroyed before the end of 1992. The UNSCOM inspections yielded much insight into the Iraqi planned nuclear weapons programme, the infrastructure and how Iraq obtained technical knowledge for the centrifuges system of enrichment, but no nuclear weapons were found (Blix, 2004: 28, 29).

IAEA inspections did reveal that by 1991, Iraq was close to the threshold of success in such areas as the production of highly enriched uranium (HEU), and the production and pilot-scale cascading of single cylinder centrifuge machines. By 1998, the IAEA concluded there was no indication that Iraq produced a nuclear weapon or that it retained physical capability for the production of weapons-usable nuclear material (Dillon, 2002: 14).

The IAEA's Consolidated Periodic Report to the UNSC listed three remaining areas of uncertainty with regard to Iraq's clandestine nuclear programme, namely the lack of credible documentation on the centrifuge design drawings obtained from foreign sources; detailed mechanical design drawings of nuclear weapons, and documentary evidence of Iraq's abandonment of its clandestine nuclear programme. The IAEA stated that although verification activities revealed no indication that Iraq possessed nuclear weapons or retained weapon production capability, IAEA activities could not guarantee that such weapons did not exist. The IAEA therefore argued for ongoing monitoring and verification (IAEA, 1999: 3, 6).

In December 1998 UNSCOM withdrew from Iraq. In view of the unanswered questions related to Iraq's proscribed weapons systems (listed in the UNSCOM Report of 19 December 1999), the UNSC adopted Resolution 1284 of 1999 establishing UNMOVIC to resume inspections (Blix, 2004: 35, 36). Resolution 1284 called on Iraq to allow UNMOVIC unconditional and unrestricted access to any facilities and equipment which UNMOVIC teams would deem necessary to inspect within its mandate. It also authorised states to permit the import of any volume of petroleum and petroleum products originating in Iraq, and stated that if Iraq complied with UNMOVIC and the relevant UNSC resolutions, it would suspend the ban on import of commodities and products originating in Iraq (UN Security Council, 1999). In return for allowing inspections, Iraq tried to extract concessions on sanctions; clarity on disarmament issues, and limitation of the scope of enquiry regarding its weapons programmes. On 5 July 2002, dialogue between UNMOVIC and Iraq had ended without agreement on inspections (Blix, 2004, 63). However, on 16 September 2002, Iraq accepted the return of weapons inspections in Iraq. In the interim, the US and the UK prepared a draft resolution which called on Iraq to cooperate on key disarmament issues. Iraq, however, objected to a new resolution that would change the agreed arrangements of Resolution 1284 (Blix, 2004, 73 - 76). UNSC Resolution

1441 of 8 November 2002 offered Iraq a last opportunity to comply with its disarmament obligations and warned that Iraq would open itself to serious consequences if it continued to violate its obligations (UN Security Council, 2002).

On 27 November 2002, UN weapons inspections resumed in Iraq. On 2 December 2002, Iraq presented a declaration to the UN which was supposed to detail every element of its WMD programme. UNMOVIC could not confirm the contents of the declaration, but was also unable to disprove it (UNMOVIC, 2002). Dr Hans Blix, the Executive Chairman of UNMOVIC, indicated that neither the declaration nor Iraqi co-operation with the inspections were sufficient to create confidence. Moreover, the declaration did not contain any new information on Iraq's proscribed weapons activities; had no supporting evidence, and did not resolve the unanswered questions in the 27 March 1999 Amorim Report and UNSCOM's Report of 29 January 1999 (UNMOVIC, 2002). In some views, Iraq may have deliberately provided an incomplete account of its systems and facilities in order to prolong weapons inspections and to buy time to conceal its activities to prevent a US invasion (Indyk *et al.*, 2002: 9, 10). Others alluded that the US hoped that Iraq would violate UNSC Resolution 1441 in order to invite military action whilst some argued that in view of the little time afforded to Iraq to produce a declaration, omissions were unintentionally made (Pollack, 2004: 5). UNMOVIC did indicate that failure by Iraq to provide documentary evidence would suggest that prohibited items may have been intentionally concealed (UNMOVIC, 2003e). Blix indicated that although no prohibited items or activities were uncovered, the absence of any finds at inspected sites was not a guarantee that prohibited items and activities did not exist (UNMOVIC, 2003b). Iraq had an earlier record of avoiding disclosures and moreover, in the four years without inspections, it could have regenerated WMD research (UNMOVIC, 2003a). The fact that Iraq was not fully cooperative with UNMOVIC on issues of process and substance, could suggest that it did have activities to conceal.

In the interim, the US continued with its military build-up as it was losing confidence in the inspections (Blix, 2004: 146). The US and the UK prepared a second draft resolution to open the way for pre-emptive force against Iraq (Singer, 2005: 1, 2). The US was prepared to defend the idea of a unilateral war and it seemingly believed it did not require an endorsement by the UNSC to use pre-emptive military force. Some Security Council members opposed this position since

force could only be authorised if the UNMOVIC reports to the UN Secretary-General indicated non-compliance by Iraq (Blix, 2004: 146). On 24 February 2003, the US, UK and Spain circulated a draft resolution stating that Iraq was in breach of its disarmament obligations. A formal vote on the use of force was never taken (Blix, 2004: 218).

3.1.1.1. Official Statements

On 28 January 2002, Bush gave a State of the Union address in which he included Iraq in the “axis of evil” and cited the danger of WMD. Critics argued that since the address, Bush had plans to invade Iraq. The US concerns regarding Iraq’s alleged regeneration of its WMD were initially cited in Bush’s remarks to the UN General Assembly in 2002 (US Whitehouse, 2002b). Bush stated that Iraq posed a threat to peace and stability in the world and that it failed to comply with UNSC resolutions, namely Resolutions 686, 687 and 1373, which among others, demanded that Iraq renounce all involvement with terrorism and prohibit terrorist organisations to operate in Iraq. He also stated that Iraq expanded its chemical and biological weapons programmes and that it retained the requisite facilities and information to rebuild its nuclear weapons programme. Finally, he stated that Iraq violated its obligations relating to UN weapons inspections and its disarmament obligations and, in this context, called on the UN to enforce the relevant resolutions (US Whitehouse, 2002b). On 14 September 2002, Bush reiterated the alleged Iraqi threat in a address to the nation and, on 19 September 2002, he sent a proposed resolution on Iraq to Congress to authorise the use of force should the former not co-operate with the relevant UN resolutions (US Whitehouse, 2002c & 2002d). The alleged Iraqi threat was again reiterated in Bush’s address on 5 October 2002, which not only referred to Iraq’s alleged WMD and links to terrorist organisations, but also stated that Congress had authorised the use of military force (US Whitehouse, 2002e).

The declared reasons were again highlighted by the then US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, in an article which appeared in the New York Times on 23 January 2003 (US Whitehouse, 23 January 2003). On 5 February 2003, Colin Powell, then US Secretary of State, addressed the UNSC on Iraq, and stated that the US had an obligation to ensure that Iraq complied with its UN

obligations. He also reiterated that Iraq was in defiance of Resolution 1441, and requested the Council to issue Iraq with an ultimatum (US Whitehouse, 5 February 2003).

Irrespective of US appeals to the UNSC to authorise the use of military force against Iraq, a vote on a second resolution, following Resolution 1441, was never taken. No evidence was found to support the officially declared reasons. On 17 March 2003, in an address to the nation, Bush called on Hussein to step down and reiterated that the US Congress voted to support the use of force against Iraq (US Whitehouse, 2003c). On 19 March 2003, coalition forces, led by the US, started military operations in Iraq (US Whitehouse, 2003d).

In several updates to the nation, Bush outlined the status of combat operations; efforts by the coalition forces in locating Al Qaeda cells and other terrorist organizations, and efforts in spreading democracy in Iraq (US Whitehouse, 2003e). However, coalition forces found no WMD in Iraq. Despite this, Bush reiterated that coalition forces would find the alleged WMD (US Whitehouse, 2003f). On 23 September 2003, Bush addressed the UN General Assembly (UNGA) on the progress of Operation Iraqi Freedom. Despite continued efforts in the search for WMD, none were found and no link was established between Hussein and Al Qaeda (US Whitehouse, 2003g).

In addition, UNMOVIC did not uncover any evidence of prohibited items or activities. Its official opinion prior to the start of the war was that there was no evidence that Iraq possessed WMD or that it was in the process of regenerating related programmes (UNMOVIC, 2003b). This position was reflected in another briefing to the UNSC (UNMOVIC, 2003e).

By 17 March 2003, the IAEA had found no evidence or indication of the revival of a nuclear weapons programme in Iraq. However in its Report of 14 April 2003 to the Security Council, the IAEA indicated that it did not complete its investigations into whether Iraq attempted to regenerate its nuclear programme between 1998 and 2002 (IAEA, 2003).

The following sub-section will provide a critical analysis of official US views on WMD in Iraq, largely refuting the US claims.

3.1.1.2. Analysis

The ISG concluded in its Final Report (2004a: 41, 44) that in the years following the Gulf War, Hussein sought to preserve the ability to regenerate WMD programmes while seeking sanctions relief through co-operation with UNSCOM and later UNMOVIC. It concluded that Hussein never totally abandoned his WMD programmes and therefore retained a cadre of skilled scientists to facilitate the reconstitution of WMD programmes after sanctions were lifted. It also concluded that although Iraq did not reach the point of producing nuclear weapons, its acceptance of the OFF Programme allowed Hussein to earn illicit revenue and that Iraq was able to finance selected illicit procurement programmes namely for conventional weapons, WMD precursors and dual use technology. Moreover, the ISG found that no evidence existed that Iraq possessed stocks of WMD in 2003 (Iraq Survey Group, 2004a: 56, 64, 66).

Overall, the ISG findings suggest that Iraq did retain prohibited WMD programmes but that these were not as extensive or threatening as the NIE suggested. Although Hussein desired nuclear weapons, Iraq's WMD programme was dormant at the time of invasion and some critics suggest that Iraq would have required more than five or seven years to activate the programme, as opposed to the timeframe indicated by the NIE (Pollack, 2004: 4, 5).

Some critics argued that the US may have genuinely believed that Iraq did possess WMD and that a link did exist between Iraq and Al Qaeda, in view of the years of distrust between the two countries and Iraq's history. But this did not discount the possibility that intelligence could have been exaggerated to force a decision by Bush for war (Hallenberg, 2005: 28).

There was no evidence that Iraq posed an imminent threat to US security and that it intended on attacking the US homeland. Even if Iraq contemplated an offensive against the US, it would have faced severe international condemnation; risked retaliation from US allies in the region namely Israel, and it would have demonstrated that Hussein was deceiving the international community. Furthermore, any use of WMD would have justified US claims about Iraq's alleged capabilities (Iraq Survey Group, 2004a: 66). However, since Hussein intended retaining power, it is plausible to assume that he would have undertaken any measure to protect his dictatorship (Iraq Survey

Group, 2004a: 66). Some critics suggested that there was a possibility that during the time when the reasons for war were debated at the UN, Iraq could have exported its weapons to its allies, or concealed them (Kruys, 2006: 79).

Nevertheless, the US claim of Iraq's alleged WMD can be discredited since Iraq's military capability and its WMD programmes were more viable in the 1980s, when Iraq's military arsenal included medium range missiles, a functioning air force and a large stockpile of chemical and biological weapons. Previous US Administrations provided Iraq with overt economic subsidies and covert military support. Inadvertently, the US covert support to Iraq enhanced Iraq's ambitions for nuclear power (Zunes, 2002: 4).

In view of the above, and the criticism that the US intelligence agencies received for failing to provide credible evidence in support of this claim, the following sub-section will discuss the intelligence failures that occurred in intelligence gathering and assessment.

3.1.2. Intelligence Failures Regarding Iraq's Alleged WMD

Following the end of the conventional war in Iraq, coalition forces failed to uncover any evidence to support claims that Iraq possessed WMD. Consequently, this fueled media criticism against the US for going to war with Iraq without substantiating the alleged threat. Moreover, the lack of credible evidence suggested that Iraq did not pose an immediate threat. This raised debates that US and UK intelligence agencies possibly misrepresented intelligence to build a case for the war. In accordance with the above, this sub-section will discuss the official position of the US relating to intelligence failures as well as provide an analysis of various viewpoints by critics on this issue.

In 2004, following the end of the conventional war, and against the background of media criticism of intelligence gathering, Bush and then UK Prime Minister Blair, ordered an investigation of the intelligence gathering capabilities of their respective intelligence communities (Kruys, 2006: 77). According to the 2005 Report to the President of the United States of the Presidential Commission on the Intelligence Capabilities of the US Regarding

Weapons of Mass Destruction, the intelligence community was incorrect in its pre-war judgments regarding Iraq's alleged WMD and analysts seemingly accepted any information that supported their belief that Iraq had stockpiles and was developing nuclear programmes. However, it also indicated that no pressure was placed on the intelligence community to misrepresent or fabricate intelligence, and that the intelligence community did believe that its intelligence was accurate, albeit that such intelligence was actually incorrect (US Whitehouse, 2005: 4, 8, 11). It concluded that the errors were mainly caused by poor intelligence collection, an analytical process that was based on assumption and failure by the agencies to test the evidence it collected (US Whitehouse, 2005: 47- 48).

Critics of the war have argued that US intelligence agencies fabricated intelligence with regard to the declared reasons put forward by the US and the UK, namely the alleged Iraqi WMD; the regime's alleged links to Al Qaeda, and the perceived Iraqi threat to US national interests, in order to build a case for war. They argued that since Iraq and the Middle East is of strategic importance to the US, the intelligence agencies falsified information to convince the international community of an Iraqi threat and to mask the actual motives (undeclared reasons) for the war (Sadruddin, 2006: 1). In line with this, critics opined that the US needed a pretext for the war in order to advance US interests, namely to ensure US military presence in the region; protection of its allies; democratisation of the Middle East, and access to US oil interests (Hammons, 2005: 1). Others alluded that US policy makers and intelligence officials misrepresented intelligence in order to prompt the Administration's decision to invade Iraq, keeping in mind the broader US interests in the Middle East (Sadruddin, 2006: 1).

Although the US October 2002 NIE stated that Iraq continued with its WMD programmes in defiance of UN resolutions, critics have argued that the NIE was largely based on the estimates of the numbers of weapons and materials unaccounted for when UNSCOM ended its inspections in 1998 (Cirincione *et al*, 2004: 15). The NIE as well as other intelligence reports served as a basis on which the US and its allies built their campaign against Iraq. Overall, the intelligence failures in the lead-up to the war pointed to possible gaps in how intelligence was obtained and collated; raised questions as to the credibility of the US and UK intelligence community, and the extent to which agencies may have been influenced by corporate interests (Hammons, 2005: 2).

Some have argued that although the intelligence community overestimated Iraq's WMD capability, it may have genuinely believed that Iraq possessed WMD. Others suggested that the intelligence community presented views that were not consistent with those of senior Administration officials' beliefs. Prior to the war, the US established the Office of Special Plans (OSP), and some analysts allege that intelligence produced by the OSP presented a different perspective to that of the CIA and State Department and therefore intelligence was selectively chosen to reflect the pre-existing position of the Administration. In view of this, it is likely that the Administration could not make an informed decision about the correct course of action (Pollack, 2004: 13 - 15). The intelligence community also seemingly exaggerated the timeframe for Iraq's acquisition of WMD and consequently believed that Iraq would acquire a nuclear weapon within a year. This may have created an imperative for the US to act immediately (Pollack, 2004: 10, 15).

Other critics opined that the intelligence presented by the US and UK intelligence community was inaccurate, largely due to the unavailability of information; the secrecy of the target (Iraq), and the lack of means to obtain information. They also suggested that the intelligence community over-relied on technological means to obtain information rather than on human intelligence. It has also been suggested that different officers analysed different pieces of data and therefore certain key pieces of information could have been ignored (Kruys, 2006: 71).

The US and UK media created the impression that intelligence totally failed, therefore triggering the debate on intelligence failure. The debate surrounding Iraq's alleged WMD continued for months following the invasion (Kruys, 2006: 79, 80). Since there is no proof that the intelligence community fabricated evidence, it can be argued that intelligence was largely incorrect or negligently exaggerated.

3.2. Iraq's Alleged Links to Al Qaeda and Intelligence Failures

In the context of official US statements and the October 2002 NIE of the US, this section will briefly discuss US claims of Iraq's alleged links to Al Qaeda and will also discuss the failure by the intelligence community in providing evidence in this regard. Furthermore, the section will also provide an analysis of this declared reason as perceived by various critics.

3.2.1. Iraq's Alleged Links to Al Qaeda and Terrorism

The second declared reason for the war was the alleged link between the Iraqi regime and Al Qaeda. Some studies argue that should 9/11 not have taken place, the US may not necessarily have developed a policy on war with Iraq. However, 9/11 spurred a theoretical nexus between terrorists and WMD and in view of Iraq's historical record of WMD programmes, the US argued that the elimination of Al Qaeda should be followed by an elimination of Hussein and Iraq's alleged WMD (Blix, 2004: 266).

The 2002 NIE alluded that Hussein could have possibly decided to cooperate with Al Qaeda if he feared an imminent attack on his regime, or if he wanted to carry out revenge against the US. It also asserted that Hussein could have possibly decided to assist the Islamist terrorists in conducting a chemical, biological or nuclear attack against the US in the future. However, the NIE could not indicate a timeline for when Hussein would have decided on such a venture (US CIA, 2002).

Against the background of the 2002 NIE on Iraq and its alleged links to Al Qaeda, the following sub-section will highlight official US statements made in the lead up to the war relating to the alleged links. It will also briefly mention the findings of the 9/11 Commission in this regard.

3.2.1.1. Official Statements

Based on the NIE, the US claimed links between Iraq and Al Qaeda. During the time when US concerns regarding Iraq's alleged WMD were initially cited, Bush stated in his address to the UN General Assembly in 2002 that Iraq did not renounce its involvement with terrorism (US Whitehouse, 2002b). Iraq's links to terrorist organisations were again reiterated in Bush's radio address on 5 October 2002 (US Whitehouse, 2002e). On 28 January 2003, Bush reiterated in his State of the Union Address, that Iraq could provide WMD to terrorists (US Whitehouse, 2003a). He also stated that the combination of Iraq, WMD and terrorism posed an unacceptable threat to the US. In an address to the UNSC, Powell reiterated Iraq's links to Palestinian militant groups and linked that to an alleged connection between Iraq and the Al Qaeda terrorist network and

Iraq's alleged support to this group (US Whitehouse, 5 February 2003). Despite these claims, US intelligence agencies were unable to prove the alleged link between Iraq and Al Qaeda.

The 9/11 Commission (US National Commission, 2004: 61, 66) stated that after Bin Ladin moved to Sudan in 1991, he was willing to cooperate with Iraq. Hussein, however, did not have an Islamist agenda and since Bin Ladin previously sponsored anti-Saddam Hussein Islamists in Iraqi Kurdistan, Hussein was not willing to forge links with Al Qaeda. Later Bin Laden agreed to stop supporting activities against Hussein but he continued to support an Islamist extremist group in Kurdistan. After the group formed an organisation called Ansar al Islam, there was some indication that Iraq assisted the group against the Kurds.

The 9/11 report mentions that in mid-1998, Iraq approached Bin Ladin to forge co-operation, after Bin Ladin's public fatwa issued against the US. Various meetings seemingly took place in 1999 between Iraqi officials and Bin Ladin. According to reports, Iraqi officials offered Bin Ladin a safe haven in Iraq, but he declined. Foreign intelligence reporting seemingly indicated a mutual hatred for the US. Nevertheless, the Commission found no evidence that these contacts developed into a collaborative operational relationship (US National Commission, 2004: 66).

3.2.1.2. Analysis

In the 1970s and the 1980s, Iraq supported Palestinian militant groups against Israel. This stemmed from Hussein's desire to play a key role in the Arab/Israeli conflict and to advance Iraqi interests. Iraq later abandoned its involvement with terrorism since such involvement would have cut off Western assistance for Iraq's war with Iran and it was inconsistent with Iraq's pan-Arab leadership aspirations. Furthermore, involvement with international terrorism would also have undermined Iraq's position in the UN. As Iraq shifted towards the more moderate Arab camp, terrorism was counterproductive. And although Iraq tried to resuscitate its involvement with terrorist groups during the 1990s, its ties to most organisations were severed and some were not interested in collaborating with it (Pollack, 2002: 153, 155).

No evidence was found that Iraq may have been linked to the 9/11 incidents. Hussein was a secular modernist and therefore opposed fundamentalists. No evidence was found to support the claim that Iraq was inclined to use terrorism against the US. Critics argued that Iraq posed a longer term threat and that even by 2002, Iraq was years away from posing an immediate threat to US interests. Although Iraq was a state sponsor of terrorism, terrorism was the least of its priorities (Pollack, 2002: 149).

Some analysts argued that although the chances of Hussein forming an alliance with Al Qaeda's extreme Islamic Osama Bin Laden were small, any such alliance could have likely led to a far greater catastrophic terrorist attack than 9/11. If US foreign policy makers believed this line of argument, then it can be argued that the war was fought to eliminate such a risk (Hallenberg, 2005: 28).

Bush seemingly was under pressure to ensure that a second 9/11 would not occur. There may have been a broad sense within the US Administration that the toppling of the Taliban in Afghanistan was not sufficient to demonstrate that the US could forcefully repel threats that it faced after 9/11. Therefore critics of the 2003 Iraq war argued that the war was motivated by the US need to demonstrate that it had the superior military strength to strike against any suspected threat, especially Al Qaeda and its affiliate organisations (Hallenberg, 2005: 26, 27).

The US believed that winning the Iraq war and promoting democracy would reduce incentives for terrorist groups in the region. But the war resulted in a rapid deterioration of US standing in the Islamic world and this presented a great challenge to the US in terms of achieving its objectives in Iraq and in fighting the war on terrorism. The war also gave rise to an insurgency that prevented the US from selling the concept of democracy to the ordinary Iraqi's as well as to various civil society and religious groups, and created challenges for US forces to contain the violence in the country (Singer, 2005: 7).

The US seemingly did not consider the implications of its long term occupation of Iraq, namely the long drawn out battle between US forces and the insurgents. Some have argued that the US occupation of Iraq benefitted the wider Al Qaeda movement through serving as a base for the

recruitment of fundamentalists and extremists. Therefore the war enhanced Al Qaeda as a global force against Western interests. Largely the US occupation was perceived by fundamentalist Islamic groups as an intrusive operation, thereby fuelling anti-US sentiment. Moreover, Arab and Muslim communities believed that the war was an attack on Islam and an attempt to subjugate an Arab state (Byman & Pollack, 2008: 59).

Although no significant connection was found between Iraq and Al Qaeda, some analysts have suggested that in view of their mutual hatred of the US, they could possibly have co-operated in the future. However, it is not certain whether Hussein would have risked this and provided more active support (Pollack, 2002: 156, 157).

3.2.2. Intelligence Failures Regarding Iraq's Alleged Links to Al Qaeda

Despite US claims of an alleged link between Iraq and Al Qaeda, the intelligence community could not provide substantial evidence to support the claims. Supporters of the war could have based their claims on the offer by Iraq to provide safe haven to Bin Laden in the late 1990s, and on some alleged contacts between Iraq and Al Qaeda (US National Commission, 2004: 66). Nevertheless, the US could not substantiate Iraq's involvement with Al Qaeda nor could it prove Iraq's involvement in the 9/11 incidents. Following the 9/11 incidents, Bush speculated whether Hussein might have been involved in the attacks (US National Commission, 2004: 334). On 12 September 2001, Bush ordered an investigation into possible Iraqi links to 9/11. According to a memo entitled Survey of Intelligence Information on Any Iraq Involvement in the September 11 Attacks, there was some anecdotal evidence which linked Iraq to Al Qaeda. But no compelling case was found that Iraq planned or perpetrated the attacks. Furthermore, Bin Laden resented the secularism of Hussein's regime and moreover, there was no evidence that Saddam cooperated with Bin Laden on unconventional weapons (US National Commission, 2004: 62).

The failure by the US and the UK to prove Iraq's involvement with Al Qaeda was criticised in the overall debate on intelligence failures relating to Iraq's alleged WMD. The following section will briefly discuss the third declared reason for the war namely the promotion of democracy in Iraq.

3.3. The Promotion of Democracy In Iraq

In addition to the two declared reasons discussed above, the US stated that the war against Iraq was also fought to promote democracy and political change in Iraq. This goal became more pronounced in the lead-up to the war, especially as finding evidence on Iraq's alleged WMD appeared unlikely. Although there is no official definitive order of importance in terms of the three declared reasons, the promotion of democracy is an important aspect of US foreign policy (Hallenberg, 2005: 29). The US believed that if it succeeded in promoting democracy in Iraq, this would have other positive results. Nevertheless, critics argued that the US used this as a pretext for the invasion by drawing on the ideals of democracy. Against the background of official US statements in the build up to the war, this section will discuss why the US was keen on promoting democracy in Iraq and the broader Middle East, as well as provide an analysis of this reason as an objective of the war.

3.3.1. Official Statements

Bush's 20 January 2001 inaugural address emphasised the importance of promoting democracy and freedom in the Middle East, as well as the importance of defending US allies and US interests (US Whitehouse, 2001). Studies suggest that following Bush's inaugural address, two camps formed in the US Administration, namely idealists that supported advancing democracy in the Middle East and realists who opposed it. The critics warned that democracy would not necessarily contain terrorism and overthrowing benign dictators could pave the way for less benign radicals. Idealists, however, argued that the spread of democracy in the Middle East would prevent wars and reduce terrorism. Others argued that the US should have encouraged incremental change by strengthening indigenous democrats through moral, political and material support to facilitate peaceful political transitions (Muravchik, 2005: 2).

In the aftermath of the 9/11 incidents, the US perceived the authoritarianism and related economic underdevelopment prevalent in the Middle East as an inherent threat to its interests. The US argued that Middle Eastern political and economic conditions created a fertile environment in which terrorist groups were likely to thrive, with disaffected youths turning to

Islamist radicalism in view of the absence of democratic structures for political dissent, or opportunities for personal economic and social advancement (Singer, 2005: 5). It concluded that any struggle against terrorism should prioritise political, social and economic development in the Islamic world.

In accordance with the above, the following sub-section will briefly mention official US statements relating to the promotion of democracy in Iraq and the Middle East. These statements are indicative of the value the US attaches to the promotion of democracy in the region, also as a means to eliminate opportunities for terrorist recruitment.

Although the US did not articulate the promotion of democracy in Iraq as a reason for the war in its initial statements, Bush did make reference to the promotion of democracy and the creation of a politically stable Iraq in his 28 January 2003 State of the Union address. He also emphasised the necessity to protect the US from threats of terrorism and the axis of evil within the context of spreading democracy in the Middle East (US Whitehouse, 2003a). On 26 February 2003, Bush discussed the future of Iraq following its envisaged disarmament, either through co-operation with the UN or by way of force. He cited that by rebuilding and reforming Iraqi institutions as well as by spreading democratic values in the country, opportunities for terrorist recruitment would be reduced and, that a democratic Iraq could possibly facilitate a resolution to the Israel/Palestine conflict (US Whitehouse, 2003b).

In his 17 March 2003 address to the nation on war with Iraq, Bush reiterated the importance of the promotion of democracy in Iraq and of reforming Iraq's political institutions (US Whitehouse, 2003c). After major combat operations ended in Iraq, he outlined that the primary goal of the coalition forces was to ensure self-government of the Iraqi people through democracy (US Whitehouse, 23 September 2003).

Despite US claims that democracy in the Middle East would have long term benefits namely peace, stability and security, many countries rejected the notion that Western democracy and justice are universally applicable.

3.3.2. Analysis

It has been argued that the US may have used the goal of promoting democracy to signal to Arab regimes that it would no longer tolerate authoritarian and undemocratic forms of government in the region. The US seemingly believed that democratisation would increase its leverage to force reforms on regimes whose co-operation it required to maintain stability in the Middle East. Traditionally, US policy favors the stability of friendly regimes regardless of how autocratic they are (Ottaway, 2005b: 176).

The US believed that the promotion of democracy in Iraq would lead to the democratisation and stabilisation of the Middle East region, which would ultimately diminish recruitment opportunities for Al Qaeda and other terrorist sponsoring. Despite this, many countries in the Middle East are still authoritarian and serve as fertile ground for terrorist recruitment (Hallenberg, 2005: 29). Overall, it can be argued that the goal of promoting multi-party democracy in Iraq was to prevent Iraq from fuelling global insecurity and to isolate any future potential threat (Feldman, 2004: 18). Moreover, the realisation of this goal would have ensured that there would be no disruptions to the flow of oil. The US may have believed that by establishing a democratic Iraqi government favorable to US interests, it would be able to secure a monopoly over oil production and that the disruptions to the flow in oil would be less probable than in a region that is authoritarian and unstable. Therefore the US may have considered the access to oil and the free flow of oil to world markets in its discussions preceding the invasion (Hallenberg, 2005: 31).

The US may also have believed that a democratic Iraq could have improved prospects for a peaceful resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian crisis, and that the new Iraqi government would either voluntarily or through coercion recognise Israel. Furthermore, it may have believed that by ousting Hussein, militant Palestinians would be deprived of their most important ally among Arab states and that the power of moderate Palestinian forces willing to negotiate with Israel would increase (Ottaway, 2005b: 177-179). Despite this, the Iraq war hardened the positions of militant Palestinians and spurred an axis of rejectionist states (including Iran) against US regional foreign policy and its involvement with Israel (Bouillon, February 2007: 2). Therefore,

the war indirectly affected the peace process (Ottaway, 2005b: 181). Overall, the Iraq war reduced US credibility internationally as a promoter of democracy and of global security (Williams, 2003: 47).

Although the US may have believed that a democratic Middle East would be peaceful, stable as well as relatively sympathetic to its interests in the region, a more democratic Middle East would not necessarily guarantee that US policies would be favored. It has been suggested that unlike the US, which associated terrorism with the absence of democracy in the Middle East, Arab countries did not perceive the lack of democracy to be the root of terrorism. In view of this, Arab countries were sceptical of US initiatives in promoting democracy in the region and likely believed that this declared reason was a smokescreen for a broader US strategy in the region. Largely, the Arab world equated democracy with westernisation (Barber, 2005: 121).

Even if democratisation of the Middle East could partially address regional security problems and curb terrorist activities, it has been argued that any positive impact that democratisation of Iraq may have on the region, would take place in the long term (Singer, 2005: 5). Nation building in Iraq would be met with armed resistance; it would radicalise some parts of the population; and the institutions required for a durable democracy would not be created, therefore possibly discouraging democratic reform in the region (Paris, 2003: 406, 407). Some, however, argued that even if Arab countries were to accept democracy, fundamental elements within these states would likely attempt to subvert the democratic process (Hallenberg, 2005: 30 – 31).

Although in principle, democracy cultivates tolerant, liberal or moderate societies, this does not imply that the lack of democratic culture in some countries instigates terrorism. Largely, the US policy of intervention and its relationship with Israel have fuelled anger and resentment in the Middle East region resulting in an increase in terrorist activity (Zunes, 2004: 3, 5). Nevertheless, it can be argued that the US did have a genuine interest in promoting democracy in Iraq and the region in view of the benefits it would yield. The holding of elections and the gradual reform of Iraq's political institutions signify that the US intended to promote democracy in Iraq (Ottaway, 2005b: 178 - 179).

4. CONCLUSION

The declared reasons for the 2003 invasion of Iraq were principally Iraq's alleged WMD, the alleged Iraqi regime's link to Al Qaeda and other terrorist groups as well as the promotion of democracy. Despite US claims, no evidence was found to support the US case for the war based on WMD and terrorism and most critics of the US-led war believe that the US intelligence agencies fabricated intelligence to help build a case. The US claimed that the invasion of Iraq was part of the overall campaign against terrorism. Given the loss of life suffered during the 9/11 terrorist bombings, the US adopted a more aggressive strategy to counter possible threats to the US homeland. Following the invasion of Afghanistan in October 2001, the US proceeded to build a case for the invasion of Iraq. Supporters of the war argued that Iraq continued with its WMD programme long after the departure of UN inspectors from Iraq in 1998, and that Iraq had sufficient time to rebuild its nuclear programme. They also argued that diplomacy would not have addressed the alleged Iraqi threat. Nevertheless, there was no evidence to substantiate the case for war relating to Iraq's alleged WMD and its alleged links to Al Qaeda.

UN member states that opposed the war argued for diplomacy, sanctions and an ongoing UN weapons inspection regime to resolve the US claims of Iraq's alleged WMD. Critics of the war, however, alleged that the US was opposed to diplomatic efforts since diplomacy would not have guaranteed the US forces entry into Iraq, in order to implement its undeclared objectives in Iraq and the Middle East region, namely securing Israel's status in the region; securing Iraq's oil reserves; promoting the US military-industrial complex and US corporate interests, and expanding US military presence in the region (Hooshiyar & Karimi, 2005: 3).

The following chapter will discuss those US interests that may have formed part of the undeclared reasons for the war. Although this chapter concludes that no evidence was found to support US claims of Iraq's alleged WMD and its alleged links to Al Qaeda, it can be argued that these declared reasons could have been genuine concerns in the US Administration, especially following the 9/11 incidents. These reasons, as well as the goal of promoting democracy, formed part of the declared reasons for the war. And, although the first two reasons could be discredited, they still played an important role in building a case for the Iraq war. It will also further be

argued in the next chapter that although the undeclared reasons for the war were not publicly stated by the Administration, they were significant to the attainment of US strategic interests.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE UNDECLARED REASONS FOR THE SECOND GULF WAR

1. INTRODUCTION

Notwithstanding the declared reasons for the 2003 US-led war against Iraq, it is argued that the US also had subjective (undeclared) reasons for going to war. It has been stated that the undeclared reasons for the war included the US interest in Iraq's and the region's oil resources; to prevent competition from rival multinational companies in Iraq and the region; to prevent the pricing of oil in the euro currency; to secure US hegemony and US dominance in the region; to serve the interests of the US military-industrial complex, and to prevent a regional threat to Israel. Some studies have linked the declared reason of the promotion of democracy in the region to the undeclared reasons, and asserted that the war was part of a larger strategy of global political and economic dominance for the US as the promotion of peace, stability and democracy in Iraq could persuade Arab governments to implement liberal policies favourable to US interests (Williams, 2003: 36).

In line with the above, the declared reason of the promotion of democracy provided the US with a pretext for its continued engagement in the Middle East region to secure its undeclared interests. Iraq was as an attractive option for the US to wage war against, in view of the former's domestic situation, its regional policies and due to the country's strategic value. Therefore, it could be argued that the invasion enabled the US to further expand its geo-political reach into the region (IRMEP, 2004).

This chapter will provide an overview of US Middle East policy and interests, by examining the strategic importance that it attaches to the region. With reference to official statistics by the International Energy Agency (IEA) and the US Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration (EIA), it will briefly examine the region's energy potential; Iraq's potential for oil production and exportation, as well as Iraq's oil industry following the 2003 war. This

chapter will mainly discuss the alleged undeclared objectives that the US aimed to secure in the region.

2. STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE OF THE MIDDLE EAST REGION AND IRAQ

In the mid-1980s, the US paid little attention to the prospect of the diminishing reliability of energy supplies despite the fact that energy has been a core component of its national security concerns. The restoration of the US energy situation since the 1970s masked underlying characteristics of dependence on other region's for oil, and the US demand for oil has grown due to the increase in population size; the increase in industrial activity and diversification of the economy; the growth of the transportation sector, as well as the dwindling reserves of US oil (Goldman, 1987: 288). The US has mainly relied on the Middle East to meet its oil needs, and despite new energy discoveries in other regions such as Africa, US strategic dependence on Middle Eastern energy exports has not decreased (Cordesman, 2004: 4).

A number of factors make the Middle East and the Arab Gulf a region of importance for the US, such as the region's strategic position and the availability of oil. Overall, the US economic and political objectives in the region have remained consistent, namely its interest in promoting regional stability; to maintain its military presence in the region; to ensure uninterrupted commercial access to resources and markets; to maintain freedom of navigation; to protect US citizens and property, and to promote the security of regional friends and allies (Zinni, 2005: 142, 143). Largely, the routing of pipelines; the policing of shipping lanes; and the management of regional influences, depend on US geo-political and military commitments. In retrospect, the US provides a collective service to states that enhance US international hegemony, to the extent that US companies, US geopolitics and its military power, are given leeway to manage the world oil industry. Hence, some argue that US power serves the interests of oil consuming countries and that US military deployments seek to prevent disruptions to, and shortage of oil supplies; to balance world oil prices, and to expand and diversify oil supplies (Bromley, 2008: 103, 104). The US therefore believed it had a strong case for intervention in Iraq taking into account the central position that the greater Middle East occupies in international politics. The US may also have believed that refraining from intervention in the region would increase the likelihood that

radical Islamic groups would rise to power and control the region's energy resources (Klare, 2003: 14). In line with the US policy on nuclear non-proliferation, the US possibly saw the war on Iraq as a means to prevent anti-Western forces from gaining control over energy resources and from using oil to purchase armaments and to pursue nuclear weapons (Cordesman & Al-Rodhan, 2006a: 64).

Central to understanding why the US invaded Iraq, is to gain insight into the Middle East's oil production potential and its estimated petroleum reserves. Against this background, it has been argued that the US went to war with Iraq mainly to integrate Iraq's oil into international markets and to strengthen its position in the Gulf region, in order to ensure its long term supply of energy (Bromley, 2008: 137). In keeping with the above, the following section will briefly discuss the region's energy potential.

2.1. Strategic Value of the Middle East as a Source of Petroleum

The world's endowment of ultimately recoverable oil resources in the ground is estimated at some 900 to 1500 billion barrels. Energy analysts have questioned whether the gains in any region from new exploration, drilling and production technologies can be sustained, especially since peak discovery of new oilfields occurred in the 1960s and since the rate of discovery has declined in the past few decades. Furthermore, new discoveries could be below replacement rate for current production, which suggests that any respective oil producing region could reach peak oil production, resulting in the increase in oil price and a demand to revert to alternative forms of energy. However, it has been suggested that giant new oilfields are likely to be discovered in regions previously closed to exploration for political reasons, namely the Middle East (Cooperman, 2004: 1 - 3). The Middle East will remain central to world oil security since it currently accounts for 30 per cent of the world's oil production, 40 per cent of global oil exports and for some 65 per cent of global oil reserves. In terms of energy reserve projections and total proven reserves, the Middle East region ranks significantly above other leading oil producers (Cordesman, 2004: 9, 12). Furthermore, estimates of the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region's world total oil share have increased steadily (Cordesman & Al-Rodhan, 2006a: 64).

The MENA energy exports have become increasingly important to the global economy and to international security in view of rising Asian demand and the overall increase in world demand for oil. Furthermore, current demand consumes much of the oil that the MENA countries produce. Analysts speculate that the MENA region will dominate world energy exports despite gradual progress in fields such as conservation; significant improvements in the supply of renewable energy; and major increases in energy supplies from gas, coal, and nuclear power (Cordesman & Al-Rodhan, 2006b: 1, 2). Even if advances were made in alternative forms of energy or conservation, (which would reduce global oil demand), higher cost oil producers in other regions would likely cease to exist or be forced to reduce their prices since the Middle East provides cheaper oil than any other oil producing region (Neale, 2004: 176). Nevertheless, energy forecasts project that the demand for oil and gas is likely to increase at high rates in view of population increases in China, India and Brazil as well as in developing countries in Africa and the Middle East (Bromley, 2008: 102, 103, 105).

Countries in the Middle East region with substantial oil reserves include Iraq, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and the UAE. During the Iran-Iraq war, Gulf countries increased their claims of reserves to obtain political status. Kuwait claimed that its reserves increased from 65, 4 bbl (billion barrels) in the early 1980s to around 90 bbl in 1985 whilst Iran claimed an increase from 58 bbl in 1982 to 100 bbl in 1987. Similarly, Iraq claimed that its reserves increased from 31 bbl in 1982 to 100 bbl in 1988 (Cordesman, 2004: 9). Nevertheless, there are gaps in estimates since few countries provide meaningful technical data and methodology resulting in different estimates of proven, probable, known, discovered and undiscovered oil reserves (Cordesman & Al-Rodhan, 2006b: 12). Mostly, variation in oil production forecasts have been due to uncertainties about the prospects for future production in the region, owing to the lack of productive capacity which requires major capital investment and foreign investment (US DoE, 2001b: 58).

Nevertheless, since the Middle East possesses significant amounts of energy reserves and since its oil and gas reserves contain an overwhelming high percentage of the world's total oil reserves, and, until such time that the global economy converts to alternative sources of energy, it can be expected that the world as well as the US will remain dependent upon the region for its energy needs (Cordesman & Al-Rodhan, 2006b: 2).

In keeping with the above, this sub-section will briefly provide official estimates by the EIA and the IEA of the world's oil reserves, conducted between 2001 – 2002, on the size of probable oil reserves and future discoveries in the world and the Middle East region.

The EIA's 2002 Annual Energy Outlook estimated that by 2020, OPEC production is projected to be over 57 mbd (million barrels per day), twice its 2000 production. It also claimed that Persian Gulf producers would account for more than 45 percent of worldwide trade by 2002, and that after 2002, the Persian Gulf share of worldwide petroleum exports would increase gradually to almost 60 percent by 2020 (US DoE, 2001b: 58, 59). According to the 2002 International Energy Outlook, the EIA estimated that the Middle East has about 702, 69 bbl in remaining reserves; 252, 51 in undiscovered reserves and 269, 19 in reserve growth whilst the OPEC region has 863, 29 bbl in remaining reserves; 395, 57 in reserve growth, and 400, 51 in undiscovered reserves. The EIA concluded that due to OPEC's large reserves and relatively low costs for expanding production capacity, it can accommodate sizable increases in petroleum demand. It also projected that the production call on OPEC suppliers would grow at an annual rate of 3.3 percent through 2020 and that its capacity utilisation would reach 95 percent by 2015 (US DoE, 2002: 32).

Similarly, the IEA also projected that OPEC's production capacity would increase. In its 2002 World Energy Outlook, the IEA projected that total OPEC oil production would reach 35, 9 mbd in 2010, to 50, 2 mbd in 2020, to 64, 9 mbd in 2030 (IAE, 2002: 96).

These estimates illustrate the strategic importance of the Middle East region and that OPEC producers are likely to meet increased production requirements, therefore increasing their share of world oil production (Bromley, 2008: 144). Overall, the Middle East region is likely to remain a critical factor in meeting global demand for oil since it has an abundance of oil reserves that it can produce cheaply (Cordesman, 2004: 8).

Having discussed the energy potential of the Middle East region, the following section will elaborate on Iraq's oil production potential, which illustrates that Iraq's oil reserves may have provided an incentive for the US to decide in favour of the war against Iraq. It will also provide

an overview of the state of Iraq's oil industry following the 2003 war, which will not only demonstrate that its oil industry had deteriorated prior to the 2003 war, but it will also explain why the US was keen to rehabilitate the industry following the end of the war, taking into account Iraq's oil reserve potential.

2.2. Iraq's Petroleum Potential and Industry

In the 2002 International Energy Outlook, the EIA suggested that Iraq's future role in OPEC in the forthcoming years would be of interest. It estimated that Iraq would maintain an oil production capacity of 3, 1 mbd into 2002, but that its exports would not generate revenues greater than those allowed by UNSC sanctions. It also noted at the time that Iraq indicated a desire to expand its production capacity once sanctions were lifted. In view of this, the US assessed that an increase in Iraqi oil exports would offset a significant portion of the price stimulus associated with current OPEC production cutbacks (US DoE, 2002: 33).

The EIA estimated that Iraq contains approximately 115 bbl of proven oil reserves, the fourth largest proven petroleum reserves in the world (behind Saudi Arabia, Canada and Iran), concentrated (65 percent) mostly in Southern Iraq. Estimates of Iraq's oil reserves and resources have varied widely since only ten per cent of the country has been explored. Iraq could also contain additional oil reserves in the Western Desert region (some 45 – 100 bbl of recoverable oil) and it has been estimated that Iraq contains 110 trillion cubic feet (Tcf) of proven natural gas reserves and some 150 Tcf in probable reserves (US DoE, 2003b: 40, 49).

The EIA also suggested that an estimated 20 percent of oil reserves are located in the north of Iraq mainly near Kirkuk, Mosul and Khanaqin. However, control over rights to reserves has been a source of conflict between the ethnic Kurds and other groups since resources are not evenly divided along sectarian-demographic lines. Most resources are concentrated in the Shiite areas of the south and the Kurdish north, with few resources controlled by the Sunni minority (US DoE, 2003a: 1, 2).

The Iraqi Ministry of Oil has control over oil and gas production and development through the North Oil Company (NOC), the South Oil Company (SOC), and the Missan Oil Company (MOC). Iraq has nine fields that are considered super giants (over five bbl) as well as 22 giant fields (over one bbl), which are concentrated in south-eastern Iraq, accounting for some 70 percent of its oil reserves. Two thirds of production comes from North and South Rumaila and the remainder from the north-central fields near Kirkuk. Iraq exports oil via the Persian Gulf port of Basra and the Iraq-Turkey pipeline in the north but its major international crude oil pipeline in the north is the Kirkuk Ceyhan pipeline with a capacity of 1, 6 mbd. The al Basra Oil Terminal on the Persian Gulf has a capacity to load 1, 3 mbd of oil and it can support large crude carriers. There are also five smaller ports on the Persian Gulf, all functioning at less than full capacity (US DoE, 2010: 5).

2.3. Iraq's Oil Industry Since the 2003 US War with Iraq

Iraq's vast energy resources, its large consumer market and its geo-strategic position make it an attractive economic partner for its neighbours and the international community. However, the 2003 war; the years of international sanctions; the high costs Iraq incurred for its 1980 war with Iran; the 1990/1991 Gulf War, and the post-2003 war violence, created conditions that limited opportunities for its neighbours to expand trade and investment in Iraq. Prior to the 2003 war, the poor state of its economy resulted in Iraq's dependence on oil revenues from the OFF Programme; an increased foreign debt, hyperinflation and unemployment (Blanchard et al, 2007: 5). Over the course of Hussein's reign, Iraq neglected to replace critical oil production related equipment from original suppliers and it failed to maintain its ports, pipelines, pumping stations and oil production capacity, resulting in the deterioration of its oil infrastructure (US DoD, 2006: 13). During the 1990/1991 Gulf War, Iraq's southern oil industry was badly damaged, with production capacity falling to 75,000 bbl per day in mid 1991. The war destroyed gathering centres and compressing/degassing stations in Rumalia; storage facilities, and the 1, 6 mbd Mina Al-Bakr/Basra export terminal and pumping stations along the 1, 4 mbd (pre – war capacity) Iraqi strategic (North-South) pipeline (US DoE, 2003a: 3).

Following the 2003 war, insurgents and terrorists attacked worksites and crude oil export and petroleum product pipelines, which impeded oil production, refining and the distribution of petroleum products, whilst reconstruction challenges; poor operational and maintenance practices; fires; dilapidated infrastructure and poor maintenance, further delayed progress (US DoD, 2005: 13). In view of the ongoing violence, Iraq's oil export future remained uncertain and contractors were dissuaded from making much needed repairs on oil infrastructure. Overall, insufficient water injection to maintain oil reservoir pressure and water supply problems; wartime damage, and reliance on outdated equipment has affected oil production (Cordesman, 2007: 14, 15). Since Iraq's oil industry is the largest consumer of electricity, significant increases in oil production would require large increases in power generation. However, Iraq has faced challenges in meeting the demand for power across Iraq.

Moreover, Iraq lacks an outlet to accommodate increases in oil production. Currently, both Iraqi refining and export infrastructure require upgrades to process more crude oil. While oil exports are running almost at full capacity in the south, the northern export capacity is still subject to sabotage (US DoE, 2010: 3, 4).

Iraq's 2010 oil production averaged 2, 4 mbd while oil exports averaged 1, 87 mbd (US DoD, 2010: 18). Iraq has begun a programme to develop its oil fields and to increase its oil production. Between November 2008 and May 2010, the Iraqi Oil Ministry signed some 12 long term oil contracts with international oil companies to develop 14 fields. The contracts cover oil fields with proven reserves of some 43 bbl. In view of this, significant foreign investment could increase Iraqi production capacity to some 12 mbd (US DoE, 2010: 4).

Overall, Iraq's bilateral and intra-regional trade levels did increase after Hussein's overthrow in 2003. Nevertheless, the ongoing sectarian violence and terrorism in Iraq has generally dissuaded multinational companies from conducting business in Iraq and forcing them to direct investments to more stable energy producing countries (Blanchard *et al*, 2007: 5). Economic terrorists have targeted the country's oil production in order to create instability; underscore US failure to stabilise Iraq, and to increase opposition to the US presence. This had strategic implications for Iraq's future (Luft, 2004: 7).

However, over the long term, the rehabilitation of Iraq's oil production infrastructure and the expansion of exploration and production could increase the availability of oil and refined petroleum products in the region. This could also create production quota competition within OPEC and affect prices and consumption patterns in global energy markets (Blanchard *et al*, 2007: 5).

Largely, it could be argued that the 2003 war against Iraq had negative implications for the resumption of Iraqi oil production and exports in view of the opposition to the US presence, and in view of the frequent terrorist attacks on Iraqi oil fields. Many opponents of the war perceived the war to have been motivated by the US interest to secure access to Iraqi oil, and therefore Iraq's oil infrastructure has been targeted. However, despite the poor state of Iraq's oil infrastructure preceding and following the 2003 war, it is argued that the US had an interest in rehabilitating the industry with a view to bring Iraqi oil into the world market.

The following section will discuss the undeclared reasons for the war. Since critics of the war have argued that oil was the principal motivation for the 2003 war, the US interest in securing access to oil in Iraq will be discussed in detail, taking into account Iraq's geo-strategic importance in the region.

3. ANALYSIS OF THE ALLEGED UNDECLARED REASONS

It has been argued that the US and the UK had several undeclared reasons for the 2003 war, of which the primary reason was oil. Since US oil production is falling gradually as consumption increases, the US may have sought to secure future oil supply to meet rising consumption (Levich, 2002: 1). Critics of the war have alluded that multinational companies and their interest in Iraq's oil reserves influenced the US decision to go to war, in view of their political influence and their close ties to their host governments (US and UK); the competition over Iraqi oil; and the profitability that Iraq's oil resources could yield (Paul, 2003: 2). In line with this, it can be argued that control of petroleum resources and pipeline routes has been a central feature in US strategy in the Middle East region (Paul, 2002a: 2). Although there is a wide belief that the war was fought for oil, literature on this subject is limited and there is no official source which can

confirm the link between oil and the war. However, many studies on this subject illustrate the link between the US government and US multinational oil companies over the years, and the economic conflict over oil access between multinationals and Iraq since the nationalisation of the Iraqi oil industry in the 1970s (Renner, 2003: 4, 5). Linked to this, the euro poses a credible alternative to the dollar as the global reserve currency. The previous chapter highlighted Hussein's intention to switch the price of oil to an alternative currency, and this would have threatened the supremacy of the dollar. Hence, it has also been suggested that the war was also fought to prevent the conversion of the oil dollar currency into the euro and to prevent a rising challenge from the European Union (EU) (Levich, 2002: 2).

It is also argued that the other undeclared US reasons for the war included securing Israel and preventing any threat to the latter; extending US dominance and military presence in the region, as well as advancing US corporate interests (Hinnebusch, 2007: 9, 10).

This section will explore the alleged undeclared reasons for the war as described above. Against the background of official US documents relating to the US energy policy and the importance of a stable oil supply to the US, it will mainly focus on the alleged US interest in Iraqi oil as well as outline the possible US objectives related to Iraq's oil industry. Reforms that the US implemented in the Iraqi economy are firstly discussed, which may illustrate the US geo-political interests in the region.

3.1. The Geo-Strategic Importance of Iraq and the US Economic Reform Initiatives

It has been argued in the previous chapter that the US believed that democratic political change in Iraq and the removal of Hussein would create a democratic Iraq which could serve as a catalyst for broader political and economic change in the Middle East region. Within the context of Iraq's geo-strategic importance, the US may have believed that the war on Iraq would assert the military dimension of US hegemony; establish a precedent that the US had the capability to demonize countries considered threats to US national security and interests, and demoralize Arab/Islamic opposition to US hegemony. Furthermore, the US believed that victory in Iraq would facilitate the establishment of US military bases in the Gulf, which would enable it to curb

resistance from nationalist states such as Syria and Iran, and moreover promote pro-Israel policies among Arab states. Overall, by promoting a liberal Iraq, the US may have envisioned that ideologies and regimes hostile to US influence would be undermined. Moreover, the US possibly believed that Iraq could counteract the policies of hostile Arab oil producers; allow the US to secure access to Arab oil, and that it would become an alternate swing producer (Hinnebusch, 2007: 13, 15).

In accordance with the above, it can be argued that the US has maintained its presence in Iraq since the end of the war to ensure that such regional objectives would be realised. The US occupation of Iraq led to the lifting of sanctions and moves towards liberalising Iraq's economy. On 22 May 2003, the UNSC lifted civilian sanctions with the adoption of Resolution 1483, which consequently terminated the OFF Programme within six months and directed that revenue from the sale of Iraqi oil be placed in a Development Fund. The resolution also called on the US Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA) to promote the welfare of Iraqis through the effective administration of the territory, restoring security and stability and creating an environment conducive to elections (UN Security Council, 2003: 4). Nevertheless, there was uncertainty regarding the CPA's status. Some point out that the CPA was created by, or pursuant to, Resolution 1483 (2003), whilst others suggested it was created by the US President, possibly as a result of a National Security Presidential Directive (NSPD) which was not made available to the public. The CPA however, was aligned with the US Department of Defense (DoD) since the US Secretary of the Army was the CPA's designated executive agent. Largely, the CPA was the subject of several protests related to reconstruction and property and services procurement contracts it awarded as well as to the Bremer Orders that it issued, which related to fiscal reform, financial sector reform, trade, legal and regulatory and privatisation, to facilitate the transition of Iraq from a state to a market-controlled economy (Halchin, 2004: 4 - 8, 20, 22).

Within the overall objective of establishing a liberal Iraq, the CPA took efforts to abandon central government control over the economy and to create independent financial and private sectors. A common view is that Resolution 1483 was instrumental in recognising the CPA, but the CPA's involvement in the funding process for work done by federal government agencies in Iraq, however suggests it was a federal entity (Halchin, 2004: 6 - 8). In line with the CPA's non-

military federal government programmes, the US “Bearing Point Plan” was awarded to BearingPoint Incorporated to facilitate economic reconstruction in Iraq (Juhasz, 2004: 1). To enable this, the CPA issued 100 Bremer Orders, more notably Order 17, granting foreign contractors and private security firms immunity from Iraqi law; Order 39 effecting the full privatisation of public enterprises, full foreign ownership rights of Iraqi businesses and full repatriation of profits, and Order 57 placing US appointed auditors in Iraqi ministries (US CPA, 2004b; 2003 and 2004a). Although these orders excluded Iraqi oil production, critics of the war argued that the orders were a means to create an economic environment favourable to the US and to promote global US corporate capitalism (Zeese, 2006: 7).

Overall, the US faced a number of challenges relating to the transformation of Iraq’s economy; its financial sector; the creation of a business friendly environment and investment climate, and the liberalisation of labour and capital markets. In terms of political reconstruction, the coalition forces were criticised for not developing a coherent strategy, which encompassed nation building in order to bridge the divide between the Sunnis, the Shiites and the Kurds. In view of these difficulties and the shortcomings in its political strategy, the credibility of the forces was reduced locally (Pollack, 2006: 54, 101).

Largely, it has been argued that the transformation of Iraq’s economy and the overturning of Iraq’s existing trade and economic laws was part of an overall strategy to benefit multi-national corporations and to promote corporate globalisation. Since liberal economic policies usually empower multinational corporations, it seems that laws favouring corporations were put in place, therefore restricting the Iraqi government (Zeese, 2006: 2). Therefore, the CPA’s economic plans suggest that the US planned an overarching economic reconstruction of Iraq, tailored to benefit foreign firms economically. Furthermore, it can be argued that such reforms may have also been intended to encourage Iraq’s neighbours such as Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, to implement similar de-nationalisation reforms more favourable to the West. This therefore illustrates the geo-strategic importance of Iraq, since Iraq’s neighbours are oil producing countries with significant oil production potential.

In addition to the above, further alleged undeclared reasons for the 2003 war will be discussed.

3.2. The Alleged US Interest in Securing Iraqi Oil

Iraq was identified as a major destabilising influence to the flow of oil from the Middle East to international markets in a report entitled Strategic Energy Policy: Challenges for the 21st Century, commissioned before 9/11 by former Vice President Dick Cheney (Baker Institute Study, 2001: 46). The report alluded to the possibility that Hussein could have decided to remove Iraqi oil from the market for an extended period of time and that Saudi Arabia would be unable to compensate for Iraq's share. Saudi Arabia's role in providing replacements has generally avoided greater market volatility, and in the event that Saudi Arabia would be unable to make up for the shortfall, this could lead to a shortage of oil on the market. It also cited concerns that Iraq had the skill to earn illicit revenues through smuggling and other uncontrolled oil exports, outside the permitted UN procedures, leading to lost production. Furthermore, the report cited concerns that Iraq was lobbying Gulf countries to close the door to US investment and to cut off oil surpluses from the market due to the US perceived bias on the Israeli/Palestinian crisis (Baker Institute Study, 2001: 23, 43, 44). Largely, it suggested that Hussein was willing to use oil and his export programme to manipulate world oil markets and that he posed a threat to regional and global order. In view of this, the US may have believed military intervention in Iraq was necessary to ensure that Iraqi oil would be released on to the world market (Hooshiyar & Karimi, 2005 1, 2).

In May 2001, the US National Energy Policy stated that the US would face an acute energy shortage in the future and that the fundamental imbalance between supply and demand will affect the US energy crisis. It was added that due to a projected shortfall of 50 percent between energy supply and demand in 2020, the US would have to increase its oil imports (US DoE, 2001a, Chapter 5: 3). In view of this, it was recommended that the US expand investment in oil producing countries, and promote the interests of US energy firms in oil production and exploration. It was also emphasised that due to the periodic overpricing of oil by OPEC, the US integrate the Caspian region's oil (where proven reserves are expected to increase) into world oil trade (US DoE, 2001a, Chapter 8: 6, 12).

The US commitment to ensuring economic growth and stability of oil producing regions was also emphasised in the 2002 US National Security Strategy, which posits the necessity for the US to strengthen its energy security; to expand the sources of energy supplies; and to enhance free trade and promote free markets in other regions (US National Security Council, 2002: 17, 19).

Although these documents do not provide evidence that the US went to war against Iraq for oil, they do illustrate the value that the US attaches to the region and they may provide some indication as to why the US viewed it critical that Iraqi oil be brought back to the world market.

In keeping with the above discussion, the US objective of maintaining its hegemonic status and increasing its global reach was also outlined in a blueprint for US global domination, entitled Rebuilding America's Defences: Strategies, Forces and Resources for a New Century, written in September 2000 by the Project for the New American Century (PNAC). Although the PNAC document was not an official policy paper, it did support maintaining global US pre-eminence, and emphasised that US global leadership relies upon the preservation of a favourable balance of power in Europe, in the Middle East and the surrounding energy producing region, and in East Asia; and the stability of the international system of nation states relative to terrorism and organized crime. The document also called for continued US engagement in unstable regions (Middle East) to protect US interests and allies (PNAC, 2000: 5, 11, 13). In line with this document, some studies have suggested that by securing political control and by intervening in regional security affairs in the Middle East, the US would be able to consolidate its global economic, military, and political dominance. These studies also stated that to advance its interests (namely to secure US access to oil resources), the US has over the past decade, invested significantly in the region by way of military intervention, arms transfers to its allies and the acquisitions of military bases (Hooshiyar & Karimi, 2005: 1, 2, 4).

It has been argued that in its pre-war planning, the US likely considered the fact that oil in other regions would deplete in several decades, and that global production would depend on reserves in the Persian Gulf. Since Iraq's western region remains largely untapped, it could yield a significant percentage of world supplies in the future (Scott, 2003: 2). Others argued that should Iraq's oil infrastructure be fully rehabilitated, it could eventually surpass Saudi Arabia's oil

production output, and, after reaching its potential production capacity, the US would welcome Iraq as an alternative supplier (Paul, 2002a: 1).

Since China, Saudi Arabia and Brazil are projected to have the highest expected growth in world oil consumption, it was also argued that the US intended to secure oil resources in order to meet domestic oil consumption needs ahead of the energy needs of emerging economic powers; to counter economic inroads of rival oil companies in Iraq, and to protect the future stakes of US oil companies in Iraq and the region (Bromley, 2006: 105, 134).

Largely, the US requires oil for economic consumption as well as to sustain its modern warfare capabilities since weapon systems rely on oil based fuel. And since the US relies heavily on its military for national security and to deter possible threats, the US requires a stable supply of oil to keep its military capabilities functioning. Furthermore, the US considers the interests of its multinational companies as synonymous with US national interests and it is therefore argued that the US would ensure that its companies control new production sources and pipeline routes (Paul, 2003: 3).

The following section will discuss the specific aims relating to the US interest in Iraqi oil, namely securing US dominance in Iraq; preventing rival multinational corporations from benefitting from Iraqi oil production, and preventing the pricing of oil in the euro currency.

3.2.1. US Aims to Regain Dominance in Iraq Oil Production

In view of the OPEC nationalisation of its oil industry in the 1970s, US policy towards the international oil industry centred mainly on providing support to US companies as the producers and distributors of traded oil as well as promoting cooperative relations with swing producers such as Saudi Arabia (Bromley, 2008: 135). This strategy was aimed at stabilising international markets; ensuring development of capacity, and expanding supply sources. Ultimately, the US purchased oil from non-OPEC markets during periods of high prices and it promoted intra-OPEC competition during periods of low price.

In the 1970s, following the 1973 Arab/Israeli war, Iraq successfully nationalised its oil industry to curb the influence of Western multinational corporations in Iraq and imposed an oil embargo against the US and other states that supported Israel. Iraq turned to the Soviet Union and deprived US and UK companies of oil resources (Sciolino, 1991: 162). Before the embargo, US and UK companies held a three quarter share of the Iraq Petroleum Company including Iraq's national reserves. In the 1980s and 1990s, French, Russian, Japanese and Chinese rival companies, however, apparently made deals with Iraq that led to lucrative production sharing agreements, which would allocate these competitors a significant share of Iraqi oil. In view of the UN sanctions regime on Iraq from 1990 to 2003, the deals did not materialise, therefore protecting the future interests of US-UK companies (Paul, 2003: 9).

Following the 2003 Iraq war, the US implemented measures to ensure US corporate control over Iraqi oil and legal immunity to multinational oil companies in Iraq. The UN Development Fund for Iraq, controlled by the US and supported by the World Bank (WB) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), aimed to leverage US government backed loans, credit and financing of US company interests in Iraq and reconstruction projects through Iraq's oil export revenues left over from the OFF Programme (Kretzmann & Vallette, 2003: 1). Thereafter, President Bush issued Executive Order 13303 on 22 May 2003, which provided absolute legal protection for US interests in Iraqi oil and prohibited any judgment, decree, execution or judicial process against US companies (US NARA, 2003). Studies have opined that this was issued to restrict the Iraqi government from politically managing Iraqi oil and to enable US corporations to control the oil from production to export (Hooshiyar & Karimi, 2005: 7, 8). It is also argued that by installing a favourable Iraqi government, the US would be able to monitor the activities of OPEC.

It has also been argued that the US believed that by installing a US client regime in Iraq, other US interests would be secured by providing the US with permanent military installations in the region; giving US and UK companies (Exxon Mobil, Chevron-Texaco, Shell, and BP) an opportunity to secure direct access to Iraqi oil; excluding possible rivals from accessing Iraqi oil reserves and development projects in Iraq; creating lucrative jobs for the oil service industry, and rebuilding and rehabilitating the Iraqi oil industry (Hooshiyar & Karimi, 2005: 7). Furthermore, the US may have hoped that the Iraqi government would support a broader wave of de-

nationalisation in its oil industry, reversing the historic changes of the early 1970s, and therefore provide more favourable terms to foreign companies and encouraging them to return to Iraq (Renner, 2003: 5).

Largely, the US need to control Iraq's oil resources and US plans to privatise the Iraqi oil industry in 2003 may have derived from Iraq's historical record of depriving Western corporate interests of oil. Due to Iraqi working class opposition against the privatisation of the oil industry, the US however put the plans on hold (Juhasz, 2004: 2). Nevertheless, the CPA's Order 39 of 20 December 2003, specified that Iraq would be tied to long term contracts with foreign firms for 40 years. Despite the Order not explicitly referring to the oil industry, it was assumed that it was inclusive of contracts in the oil industry (US CPA, 2003).

Western companies have been keen to return to crude oil production in Iraq due to lower oil production costs and higher profits than other oil producing regions, and to gain a share in Iraq's oil and gas reserves. Since these companies may have feared that they would lose their role in the world oil industry if contracts with other European and Asian competitors came into effect, they could have placed pressure on their respective governments to intervene (Paul, 2003: 3, 4, 9). Since the US and UK view control over Iraqi and Gulf oil critical to their broader military, geo-strategic and economic interests, it is likely they acted on behalf of their companies (Scott, 2003: 2).

Another argument put forward is that the US aimed to create a unified international capitalist economy under US hegemony, wherein the producer states that have gained control over production do not constitute rival imperial powers. Rather, this would constitute a network of direct bilateral deals between state-owned or state supported companies in the producing and consuming countries, therefore displacing economic competition among firms by geo-political competition among states (Bromley, 2008: 141).

The US may also have believed that a US client government would administer production concessions to US and UK companies and that this would set a precedent in the world oil industry by giving US companies carte blanche in the region's oil industry. Moreover, a US

controlled Iraqi oil economy would allow companies to export unlimited amounts of oil outside the OPEC quota system. In line with this, it has been argued that the US hoped for broader regional implications in major oil producing countries such as Kuwait, Iran and Saudi Arabia, and that they would also de-nationalise their oil companies and offer US-UK companies new concessions or production sharing agreements (Paul, 2002b: 5).

Following the war, it was alleged that US companies such as Halliburton, Bechtel and Dyncorp benefited from reconstruction projects implemented at oil plants and refineries. Halliburton was allegedly awarded the first rebuilding contract without bidding, to control oil fires; to protect and stabilise oil fields under US command, and allegedly received US \$ 443 million in defense related contracts to provide logistical support. Bechtel was apparently awarded a US \$ 600 million contract from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to cover the cost of reconstruction of critical infrastructure such as airports, roads, water and power systems, and not precluding oil fields. The awarding of these contracts sparked regional outrage since these companies have allegedly been linked politically to Washington. The US also secured the services of Dyncorp, a military contractor, to advise the Iraqi government on establishing law enforcement, judicial and correctional facilities (Hartung, 2003: 186 – 188).

Therefore, it has been argued that by ousting Hussein and by installing a new Iraqi government, the US secured a niche in Iraq's future oil production and exports. It can be concluded that the US considered privatisation of Iraq's oil industry critical, since this would ensure that US and UK companies would reap major profits and oil prices would be lowered.

3.2.2. Preventing Competition from Rival Multinational Companies

Should Iraq have complied with UNSC Resolution 1441, which dealt with its disarmament obligations, sanctions could have been lifted, and Iraqi oil production and exports could have eventually resumed and generated large revenues for reconstruction and the financing of the opening up of new fields (Baker Institute Study, 2001, 74). In such a case, the beneficiaries for the reconstruction of Iraqi oilfields would have likely been European construction and engineering firms, while oilfields would have possibly been operated by French, Russian, and

Chinese companies. In the late 1990s, Russian, French and Chinese companies tried to position themselves to win contracts to develop new oil fields in Iraq and to rehabilitate existing ones, once sanctions were lifted (Renner, 2003: 5). It was also suggested that some European and Asian firms allegedly signed deals with Iraq that would have provided them access to oil reserves (Bromley, 2008: 138).

Therefore, it can be argued that US and UK companies were strongly in favour of continued sanctions to restrict the mobility of competitors in Iraq. The US seemingly feared that the strengthening of relations between European and Asian powers with Iraq would weaken the future US bargaining position regarding oil related issues (Paul, 2002b: 6). Thus, the war may also have been fought to prevent any strategic alliance between Europe and Asia and their corporate interests with Iraq and other Middle East powers; to prevent European and Asian powers from seizing control of Iraqi assets, and to ensure the US sustains its economic and corporate influence and presence in the region.

Some have suggested that prior to the passing of UNSC Resolution 1441 on 8 November 2002, the US implied that French, Russian and Chinese companies would be excluded from future oil concession in Iraq if France, Russia and China opposed regime change in Iraq. In line with this, it was alluded that rival oil interests influenced the permanent members of the UNSC at the time when Resolution 1441 was being drafted (Renner, 2003: 6, 7). The dynamics between rival political and economic interests in the Security Council may explain the challenges the US faced in building support for the resolution. Therefore it is likely that discussions on the future of Iraqi oil formed part of US political manoeuvring by promising other permanent UNSC members a share in Iraqi oil in exchange for their political support (Scott, 2003: 2).

It is likely that should Europe have gained control over Iraq's oil industry, European companies would decide to price oil contracts from Iraq in euros rather than dollars as this would increase the demand for the euro and raise its value. If pricing did shift to the euro, it would boost the global acceptability of the single currency, especially since oil is an important global commodity and strategic factor (Engdahl, 2003: 2). In view of the strong trade link between Europe and OPEC member countries, Europe could support a move to change the oil transaction currency

and it is assumed that OPEC has not discounted the possibility of adopting euro pricing (Clark, 2003: 4, 7).

3.2.3. Preventing the Pricing of Oil in the Euro Currency

It has been argued that the war was an oil currency war and that the US goal was to prevent OPEC's momentum towards switching to the euro as an oil transaction currency (Scott, 2003: 3). In order to pre-empt OPEC, the US needed to gain geo-strategic control of Iraq; initiate massive oil production; reduce global prices, and dismantle OPEC's price controls. The US seemingly feared that OPEC would switch to the euro as a transaction currency from the dollar and therefore the US may have gone to war in order to maintain the dollar standard (Clark, 2003: 2, 3, 13). In 2000, Hussein switched to the euro and converted his reserve fund at the UN to euros. The US considered this contrary to US interests, the stability of the dollar on world markets and to the flow of oil to the West. Moreover, had Hussein convinced OPEC to convert to the euro, this would have entailed implications for the cost of US energy imports and a devaluation of the dollar currency (Gause, 1994: 181).

Critics of the war have opined that the euro-dollar threat was significant enough for the US to risk a domestic economic recession in the short term, in order to deflect the long term dollar collapse of a possible OPEC transaction standard change from dollars to euros. But this issue was not discussed by the US media or the US government since such discussion could possibly have curtailed consumer and investor confidence; reduced consumer borrowing/spending, and created political pressure for the US to form a new energy policy that would reduce US dependence on Middle Eastern oil (Clark, 2003: 3, 4).

In view of the fact that the dollar has gradually depreciated over the years against the euro, it can be argued that OPEC may in future consider converting the oil transaction currency to the euro, since OPEC countries would profit from the higher parity rate of the euro against the dollar and enable them to forge closer ties with Europe. Since the EU recognises its economic and political power as the euro rises in value, it could support such a decision by OPEC. Moreover, it has been argued that should OPEC decide to collectively switch, this would imply that oil consuming

countries would have to release their dollars from their reserve funds and replace them with euros; the dollar would depreciate in value; inflation would increase, and foreign funds would be withdrawn from US stock markets and dollar denominated assets, resulting in a current account deficit (Clark, 2003: 4, 7, 11). Since the US economy is linked to the dollar's role as a reserve currency, a link could be established between preventing a change to the euro currency and the war with Iraq and ousting of Hussein, who was keen to convert the oil currency (Isbell, 2002: 9).

3.2.4. Peak Oil and the US Need to Secure Adequate Oil Reserves

It was also suggested that the war was motivated by the importance of hydrocarbons and peak oil in the Caspian Sea region, and the importance of Iraq's oil reserves. Peak oil production ultimately implies that in several years the world will face an oil shortage. Oil fields follow a curve and once peak oil is reached, the supply of oil will begin to decline, with a corresponding increase in price, despite the growing demand for oil. Since there is no ready substitute for oil, countries will begin to compete intensively for the resource (Cooperman, 2004: 1). Moreover, many countries including the US have not developed alternative energy policies and will therefore be dependent on oil for decades (Clark, 2003, 20). In November 2000, the US Strategic Energy Institute issued a report entitled The Geopolitics of Energy into the 21st Century, which stated that the Persian Gulf would have to increase production in view of the declining oil production in other regions. Moreover, it has been suggested that US energy analysts concluded in 2001 that although significant oil reserves still existed, capacity was limited and only the Persian Gulf would be able to bridge the gap between production and demand. Therefore, it is possible that some officials in the US Administration may have thought that peak oil production was imminent and that estimates of proven reserves were exaggerated for political reasons, and thus they may have believed that the actual retrievable reserves were considerably less. Since the US requires petroleum in transportation, an imminent peak in conventional oil would affect its capitalist economy and result in an economic dislocation and slowdown (Foster, 2008: 14, 16, 19).

In view of the linkages that have been established between the US interest in securing access to oil in the Middle East; the US interest in promoting the corporate interests of its multinational

corporations; as well as its need to deny rival corporate companies access to oil resources, it has been argued that the war may primarily have been motivated by oil. Therefore, it is argued that the US went to war mainly to control Iraq's oil reserves to ensure an adequate supply of oil for US consumption and that it will rely on the Middle East region oil for its oil imports.

Within the context of the discussion of US interests in the region, the following section will briefly discuss the US objective of advancing and securing its hegemony and dominance in the Middle East, as a means to secure its economic interests in the region such as oil.

3.3. Securing US Hegemony and US Dominance in the Region

It has been stated that the US has frequently secured its political and economic interests through the application of military force throughout history (Beams, 2006: 1). It has also been stated that the US has maintained an international economic system advantageous to its economic interests and that it has seemingly violated international legal norms to secure its interests. Furthermore, it would appear that the US often influences the global economy in order to maintain its hegemony and to prevent other states from challenging its superpower status, by way of imposing free market principles on the world (Zunes, 2004: 1, 2, 4). Moreover, the US industry; the stability of its financial and monetary structure, and its hegemony depend upon the unimpeded access to oil, which has played a central role in the political and economic calculations of US imperialism (North, 2010: 5). Hegemony has both economic and military aspects. Therefore economic interests as well as political/military security are mutually reinforcing concepts and may serve to explain why the US employs military force. At the time of the 1991 Gulf War, the US envisioned a new world order, in which it would assume global dominance, and which would be accepted by the international community. Despite the US advocating that its dominance should be characterised by its commitment to international law; peace and stability between nations; and respect for democracy, it was seemingly guided by selective intervention (Brilmayer, 1994: 14, 168, 171). It has been argued that the US military is ruled by corporate interests and that it has displaced other instruments of foreign policy implementation (Johnson, 2004: 223). Generally, weak states have been forced to adjust to the

system whilst the US has taken advantage of opportunities to shape the system to prevent adversaries from dominating the course of global relations (Meernik, 2004: 85).

It has been stated that the connection between economic contradictions of capitalism and the rise of American militarism can be traced back to the Cold War era. Subsequently, markets and economic relations were reshaped to accommodate the expansion of capitalist profits in the global economy. However, the mechanisms of the post-war capitalist order began to break down resulting in a deepening economic and social crisis as well as in the struggle for markets and profits among major powers. Therefore, as various powers adopted incongruent policies and interests from that of the US, the US seemingly perceived a need to prevent the emergence of powers capable of challenging the US economically and militarily. The US global status may be challenged by emerging powers such as China which could in the future have the capacity to deprive the US of its economic and military advantage. In view of this, it may be argued that the Iraq war was indirectly related to preventing China and possibly other European and Asian powers from asserting their influence in the region (Beams, 2003b: 2, 5, 7, 8).

The 9/11 terrorist attacks on the US fundamentally changed the context for relations between the US and other major powers. Inadvertently, it provided the pretext for the US to assert the right to deploy military force to protect its national objectives (Beams, 2006: 2). Therefore, it can be argued that the war with Iraq as well as with Afghanistan in October 2001, facilitated the build-up of US military bases in the region, thus enabling the US to preserve its hegemony in the region (Beams, 2003b: 2).

In keeping with the above, the following section will discuss the alleged undeclared reason of promoting the interests of the US military-industrial complex, which will illustrate how war may serve to promote the manufacturing of weapons and weapons related research for a profit.

3.4. Serving the Interests of the US Military-Industrial Complex

One of the undeclared reasons for the Iraq war has been viewed as the promotion of the interests of the US military industry complex. Since the complex manufactures and sells weapons (for a

profit) to the US military, profit making has been linked to the theory of encouraging perpetual war, which implies an increase in demand for weapons. This alleged undeclared reason has not been covered in much detail and is difficult to substantiate. The military-industrial complex produces what is purchased with the national defence budget and therefore the war industry is considered part of the economy. Moreover, the military-industrial complex originates in market and political demand since weapons and other related equipment are manufactured and purchased on the defence budget as soon as the political leadership determines a need for war (Goldman, 1987: 84). Some have cited the concept of perpetual conflict together with the military industry complex as an approach to US long term defence. According to the theory, if there is no immediate threat to the US, then the arms industry will likely suffer without an influx of capital since weapons related research would be reduced and the US military could be smaller in size and capability (Khaleel, 2005: 26). Therefore, it would be in the US interest to be kept in a constant state of war or threat of war.

The importance that the US attached to the 2003 war is illustrated by significant spending allocated to the US defence budget, which resulted in an increase in spending on the military establishment. Funding provided to the military industry is mostly allocated to research, development and maintenance. Furthermore, the condition of perpetual war allows weapons manufacturers to prescribe technological weapons solutions for tactical and strategic deficiencies in the field as well as to sell expensive military equipment to the US military. It can be argued that the US requires a reason (wars) to ensure replenishment of military equipment and hence profit for the industry and the national economy (Khaleel, 2005: 27, 28). Therefore, the Iraq war could illustrate that the conflict may have resulted in long term strategic gains for the US military-industrial complex, through the supply of weapons and related equipment. Furthermore, private business interests in the defence industry could have played a role in influencing the decision for war against Iraq. Thus, it can be argued that the Iraq war was fought in order to sustain the US defence establishment and its national economy.

The following section will discuss the final alleged undeclared reason for the war, namely the role that Israel may have played in influencing the decision by the US to go to war.

3.5. Preventing a Regional Threat to Israel

When US foreign policy in the Middle East is discussed, Israel's role in influencing US policies is often included. In this respect, it has been argued that the 2003 Iraq war also aimed at installing an Iraqi government that would recognise Israel. The US maintains a positive relationship with Israel, since Israel is a strategic asset for the US in the region which can advance US interests. Since Israel's military is predominant in the region, Israel serves to support the mobility of US forces within the region; assists in research and development of weapons systems, and serves as a conduit for US weapons to regimes and movements where the US cannot openly grant direct military assistance, such as Guatemala under the rightist juntas and the Nicaraguan Contras (Zunes, 2006: 2, 5).

The US has often defined its interests in the Middle East in terms of Israel's situation. Opponents of the 2003 war argued that it was carried out in part to ensure Israel's security and to eliminate a strategic competitor to Israel's regional dominance (Zunes, 2006: 1). Opinion amongst academics and intellectuals, however, has differed on Israel's alleged role. Some argued that the war was less about Israel, since Saudi Arabia is more important to the US than Israel in the Middle East (Neale, 2004: 173). It has also been suggested that Iraq did not pose a realistic threat to Israel since Iraq during the final years of Hussein's rule no longer possessed a nuclear programme and its chemical weapons were accounted for and destroyed by UNSCOM (Zunes, 2006: 1, 2). Others argued that Israel and pro-Israeli groups did not push for war against Iraq and that Israel's security was not the primary motivation for neoconservative advocates of the war. Opponents of the war, who were sceptical of Bush's rationale for the war, preferred to understand the reasoning in the context of safeguarding Israel's security. Eventually, this became conventional wisdom among many opponents (Waxman, 2009: 1, 2). Linkages have also been made between securing Israel from possible Palestinian extremist attacks in view of Iraq's previous support of the Abu Nidal Palestinian movement during the 1980s as well as the Arab Liberation Front. However, Iraqi support of terrorist organisations was significantly less than that provided by other Arab governments such as Saudi Arabia, which allegedly provided funding for the Palestinian militant group Hamas. During the 1980s under the Reagan Administration, Iraq

was removed from the US list of states sponsoring terrorism, to enable the US to transfer arms to Iraq for its war (1980 – 1988) with Iran (Zunes, 2006: 2).

It has also been alleged that the Israeli lobby or the American-Israeli Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) influenced the US Congress to vote in support of the war (Hinnebusch, 2007: 23). Others have suggested that AIPAC has dictated policy to Congress for decades and that it has often provided an input for drafting critical US legislation that would set Middle East policy (Blankfort & Plitnick, 2005: 2, 3). Some, however, argue that the linkage between the war and the lobby is weak, since the US government is influenced by oil companies and the arms industry, which have stronger lobbying influence. Furthermore, Israel itself competes with US weapons manufacturers in exporting weapons to other countries (Qumsiyeh, 2007: 4). Since US support of Israel can be considered part of the US broader Middle East strategy, it can be argued that US policy towards Israel is not defined by the influence of the Jewish lobby (Plitnick, 2003: 8). However, it could be argued that the positive disposition towards Israel in the minds of decision makers could have been a factor.

Arab countries have remained suspicious of the relationship between the US and Israel and perceive this relationship as a threat to the status quo of the region. In the 1950s and 1960s Arab countries sought to distance themselves from the West, politically and ideologically. They were also reluctant to accept democracy, especially in view of their opposition to Israel and given the Arab/Israeli conflict (Ottaway, 2005a & 2005b: 162, 179). In accordance with this, it could be argued that the 2003 Iraq war was fought to prevent other regional powers from interfering in the Israeli/Palestinian issue and to ensure that Israel would gain full dominance over the Arab region (Ottaway, 2005b: 179).

However, in view of Israel's support for the US-led war, it became an easier target for insurgents and militant groups operating in Iraq following the end of the war, since the latter developed strong ties with radical Palestinian groups (Zunes, 2006: 4). Nevertheless, the war did not change Israel's interests and its position on the occupied Palestinian territories (Hinnebusch, 2007: 22). Therefore, it can be argued that the Palestinian issue did not play a significant role in influencing

the decision for war. However, it could be argued that since Israel is a strategic asset for the US in the region, it may have played some role in the US decision to go to war with Iraq.

In conclusion, the Second Gulf War was a result of the combination of the declared reasons (whether substantiated or not) put forward by the US, as well as a result of the alleged undeclared reasons discussed in preceding sections. Since the Middle East region is of critical importance to the US, it can be argued that the primary undeclared reason for the war was the US interest in securing access to Iraq's oil and other possible oil reserves in the Middle East (Hinnebusch, 2007: 10). Since no evidence was found supporting most of the declared reasons for the war, the argument for the undeclared reasons for the war appears feasible.

4. CONCLUSION

It is argued that the decision to invade Iraq in 2003 was motivated by both declared and allegedly undeclared considerations. Various studies maintain that the alleged undeclared reasons included the US interest in securing Iraqi oil; ensuring the stability and uninterrupted flow of oil in the Middle East to the West; expanding US military presence in the region; promoting the interests of the US military-industrial complex, as well as US interests in the oil industry (Paul, 2003: 1). It has also been argued that since Israel is a strategic asset to the US in the region, this may have played some role in the war (Zunes, 2006: 5).

It has been argued in depth that the war was fought to secure US access to Iraq's vast oil reserves (Beams, 2003a: 1). Oil is a lucrative commodity and in view of the world's increasing population, countries and multinational companies are competing to gain access to oil reserves to meet future energy demands (Paul, 2002a: 6). A central consideration of US foreign policy in the Middle East region is the control of petroleum resources and pipeline routes (Renner, 2003: 2). Therefore, it could be argued that it is in the US interest to maintain a significant military presence in the region: to secure its oil interests from destabilising forces and regional rivals; to prevent Asian powers from gaining access to oil reserves, and from winning lucrative oil production contracts in the region (Paul, 2002b: 6).

Although oil can be considered to have been the primary motivation, it may be argued that there were other undeclared reasons for the war, which played minor roles in US deliberations in the lead up to the war. However, these were significant enough by virtue of enabling the mobility of US military forces in the region (Israel) and enabling the US military-industrial complex to earn profit from the manufacturing of weapon systems for the war.

CHAPTER SIX

EVALUATION

1. INTRODUCTION

In the period leading up to the Second Gulf War, an intense debate arose in the international community with regard to the credibility of the declared reasons for the war put forward by the US. This also led to speculation whether intelligence was fabricated to build a case for the war. The US went to war with Iraq for three declared reasons, namely to disarm Iraq of its alleged chemical and biological weapons and to eliminate its nuclear weapons programme; to sever the alleged Iraq/Al Qaeda link, and to promote regional transformation by establishing a democratic Iraq (Danner, 2003: 3). The US also linked the declared reasons to the threat of nuclear proliferation and the possible sale of WMD to terrorist organisations (Hallenberg, 2004: 29). However, it seems that there were several undeclared reasons for the war, mostly of an economic nature. The US interest in Iraq's oil has been studied in detail, and a link between the US interest to secure access to Iraqi oil and the 2003 war has been established. Research into the other alleged reasons has suggested a link between the US need to preserve its hegemony (namely the US need to extend its military presence in the region) as well as promoting the interests of its key allies (namely Israel) to ensure the mobility of US forces in the region.

This chapter provides a summary of the research; evaluates the assumptions formulated in the introductory chapter; and draws a number of conclusions.

2. SUMMARY OF THE TEXT

This study extrapolated from the general assumption that the 2003 US-led war on Iraq was motivated by both declared and undeclared reasons. Chapter one suggested that although the US presented three declared reasons for the war, it possibly had other undisclosed reasons, or motives of which the principal one may have been the US interest in gaining control of Iraq's oil reserves. Furthermore, it also implied that since the declared reasons were largely unsubstantiated, the undeclared reasons may have played a greater part in influencing the US

decision to go to war. Overall, the objective of the study was to distinguish between the relative importance and credibility of the declared and undeclared reasons.

Chapter two explored existing theories of the causes of, and reasons for war, in order to explain the use of force as a response to security and power goals, economic interests, and liberal idealist aims. It also distinguished between the general causes of, and the specific reasons for war between states within the context of realist, liberal and conservative theories of war. Since realism provides significant understanding of the anarchic international system, and why power and security are the ultimate objectives of states, the chapter departed from the underlying causes of interstate war to explain why war is endemic in the international system. It also finally distinguished between motives for, and material, social and cultural reasons for war which are unique to each war, based on the national security interests of each state. Overall, the chapter concluded that the causes of war are general in nature and may allow war to occur, but that each war is unique.

Chapter three presented a historical background of the First Gulf War in 1991, provoked by Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990. It provided a brief introduction on the role that oil plays in the Middle East region's political and economic dynamics and how relations between Arab countries are shaped by the economics of oil (namely the pricing and supply of oil). It also emphasised that Iraq's regional ambitions appeared since its war with Iran (1980 – 1988), later followed by its invasion of Kuwait in 1990, in order to reclaim Kuwait. In this context, it was argued that the US went to war with Iraq in 1991 to contain Hussein's WMD ambitions and to liberate Kuwait, as well as to achieve its undeclared objectives in the region, namely to ensure the uninterrupted supply of oil to the West and to prevent a regional threat to Israel. The chapter also illustrated why Iraq and its alleged WMD were considered by the US and the UK as threats to international peace and security.

Chapter four departed from the argument that the 9/11 terrorist incidents in the US homeland provided a context for its war on terrorism. Since the 9/11 incidents had a profound impact on US national security, the September 2002 US National Security Strategy (adopted after 9/11), as well as the October 2002 US NIE which formed the basis for the US campaign against Iraq, were discussed. The chapter purported that the US formulated its campaign for the 2003 war against

Iraq by linking the war on terror to Iraq, and highlighting the dangers of WMD proliferation. Against the background of official US speeches and addresses, the chapter mainly discussed the three officially declared reasons for the war as well as the intelligence failures that occurred relating to the two main declared reasons. It also assessed that although there was no evidence substantiating an immediate Iraqi threat, it is possible that the US perceived a long term Iraqi threat. It was pointed out that intelligence failures were due to negligent intelligence reporting and that the US seemed to have believed in the existence of WMD.

Chapter five mainly argued that there were various undeclared reasons for the war, namely the alleged US interest in Iraqi oil; the US interest to expand its military presence in the region; the US military-industrial complex; to prevent a possible threat to Israel's dominance in the region, as well as to promote the interests of US and UK multinational corporations. It assessed the strategic importance of the Middle East as an oil producing region, as well as Iraq's petroleum potential according to official statistics of the US EIA and the IAE. In view of Iraq's geo-strategic position, and against the context of official US documents relating to the US energy policy, the economic reforms that the US undertook in Iraq following the end of the 2003 war, were discussed.

It was concluded that the alleged undeclared reasons varied in their degree of importance and relevance, and that oil was the primary factor influencing the decision to go to war. However, the other undeclared reasons were also important in ensuring the US objective of securing its hegemony in the region.

3. TESTING OF THE ASSUMPTIONS OF THE DISSERTATION

This section will test the assumptions formulated in the introduction of the study and assess whether they can be verified or not.

3.1. Assumption: Both the Declared and the Alleged Undeclared Reasons for the War Were Important in the US Decision to Go to War With Iraq in 2003.

3.1.1. The Importance of the Declared Reasons for the War

The US declared reasons for the war were reiterated in several speeches and addresses by President Bush and other key senior US Administration officials in the lead up to the war. Although the declared reason of Iraq's alleged WMD was not substantiated, this does not preclude the possibility that Iraq could have posed a threat to US national security interests in the future. UNMOVIC did acknowledge that Iraq had a history of evading weapons inspections and of avoiding complete disclosures of its WMD programmes (UNMOVIC, 2003a). In view of Iraq's lack of co-operation over the years, it is likely that it could have resumed some WMD research, and that Hussein would have retained his ambition to turn Iraq into a nuclear power in the region for as long as he remained in power. This assertion is confirmed by the ISG (2004a: 66), which noted that Hussein may have decided to regenerate his WMD programmes, should sanctions have been lifted. Similarly, Pollack (2002: 152) noted that Hussein realised that the US would not allow Iraq to assert its regional ambitions and therefore he could have possibly considered confronting the US in the future. In view of this, it is possible that the war eliminated a possible future Iraqi threat to the US, and this illustrates the importance that the declared reasons played in making a compelling case for the war, by evoking the fear that US national security was at risk.

The October 2002 US NIE stated that Iraq would have been able to produce a nuclear weapon within several months to a year (US, CIA, 2002). Cirincione *et al* (2004: 15) confirm that the NIE served as a basis on which the US and its allies formulated their campaign against Iraq. Pfiffner (2004: 30) also confirms that the NIE gave the US authority to push for war with Iraq and convince the country of the immediacy of the threat.

The importance of the reason of Iraq's alleged WMD is further illustrated by the fact that the war was conceived against the background of the 2002 US National Security Strategy, which emphasised the need for a pre-emptive strike against hostile states and terrorist groups. Hence,

the US recognised the danger of terrorists acquiring WMD and therefore used force against Iraq to prevent the emergence of a future Iraqi threat (Kaysen *et al* 2002: 3). Miller (2002: 8) confirms that the US asserted that Hussein would be far more dangerous in the future, if he did acquire WMD. This suggests that the US perceived a short term Iraqi threat which was however unsubstantiated.

The second declared reason of Iraq's alleged links to Al Qaeda was equally important in justifying the war. Since 9/11, the US emphasised Iraq had supported terrorist groups and had links to Al Qaeda (US Whitehouse, 2002b). In several speeches and addresses (referred to in this study), Bush and senior US officials reiterated the nexus between Iraq and international terrorism and stated that Iraq continued to shelter and support terrorist groups opposed to the West. Since most Americans were unaware of the inherent differences between Muslim Fundamentalists (Al Qaeda) and secular Pan- Arabists such as Hussein, they had no other basis by which to differentiate the two. Therefore, Bullock (2003: 32) suggested that the US association of the two carried significant weight when it cited Iraq's alleged Al Qaeda link in the lead up to the war.

Overall, Bush's speeches were predicated on the possibility that Hussein would seek to destroy American values by supporting terrorism and that the US cannot wait for the final proof that could manifest itself in the use of a nuclear weapon against it (US Whitehouse, 2002f). Therefore, the declared reason of Iraq's alleged link to Al Qaeda served to fuel emotional fear by referring to the 9/11 attacks in the US and the destruction they caused to the US homeland, in order to attempt to build a case for the war.

In view of the US failure to build a solid case for war, the US claimed that regime change in Iraq would facilitate the promotion of democracy in Iraq. Record (2008: 81) confirms that the promotion of democracy in the region was given more attention as a policy option in US policy making circles following the 9/11 incidents. This reason is further substantiated by the numerous pronouncements by Bush on the promotion of democracy in Iraq and the region in the build up to the war. Hallenberg (2004: 29) further confirms that the US believed that by promoting democracy in Iraq and the broader Middle East region, threats from terrorism and threats to global security would be reduced, and that the proliferation of terrorist groups and their efforts to

acquire WMD would be prevented. Therefore, the promotion of democracy in Iraq was an important reason for the war in view of the positive consequences that it could have in the region.

All three declared reasons were important in building a case for the war, since the war was motivated against the background of the war on terrorism and international efforts at preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. By citing a link between Iraq, its alleged WMD and Al Qaeda, the US was able to evoke fear of Hussein transferring WMD to terrorists and able to persuade Americans and the international community of the need for war. The US conflation of Al Qaeda and Iraq as a unitary threat illustrated that the former believed that like Al Qaeda, Iraq could not be deterred. The various speeches and addresses by Bush and US senior officials illustrated this point. Therefore, the declared reasons of Iraq's alleged WMD and its alleged links to Al Qaeda assumed high importance to the US in building its case for the war whilst the promotion of democracy was also considered important, both as a reason and as a goal.

Therefore, the importance of the declared reasons as a basis for the US decision to go to war can be verified.

3.1.2. The Importance of the Undeclared Reasons for the War

It has been maintained that the US interest in securing access to Iraqi oil was the primary undeclared reason for the war. However, there were other undeclared reasons for the war, as discussed in Chapter Five. Although these reasons may not have been the primary motivations for the war, they were important to the achievement of US regional and world hegemony, and therefore were considered in US policy-making circles prior to the decision to go to war. Paul (2003: 3, 5) suggests that the primary undeclared reason for the war was to secure US access to Iraq's oil resources and to secure favorable oil related contracts and agreements for US and UK companies. Hooshiyar & Karimi (2005: 2) confirm that since the Middle East would be able to meet an increase in world oil demand and since Iraq possesses significant oil reserves, the US was keen to gain access to Iraq's oil resources. Although the US did not disclose whether it had an interest in Iraqi oil prior to the war, US strategic policy documents such as the US Strategic

Energy Policy: Challenges for the 21st Century identified Hussein as a destabilising force to the flow of oil from the region to international markets. Moreover, the importance that the US attaches to oil as a strategic global commodity has been emphasised in various other US energy policy documents mentioned in Chapter Five.

In terms of the undeclared reason of promoting the US military-industrial complex, this reason was important since the US military industry would gain profit through the manufacturing of advanced weapons systems for the war. Khaleel (2005: 26) alluded that the US needed a war in order to direct expenses into weapons related research, development, and maintenance and that the war served to promote profit making in the military industry and to update the US military.

It is maintained that the US believed that invading Iraq would provide it ample room to exercise its influence across the region and to further expand its geo-political reach. Beams (2003b: 7, 8) purported that by extending its reach into the region, the US is able to monitor and react to emerging threats to its interests. The extension of US military presence in the region can be viewed as a measure to prevent China and possibly other European and Asian powers from asserting their influence in the region, in order to preserve US hegemony and protect US interests. Moreover, a wider US presence in the region would ensure that other US strategic interests in the region could be secured. Therefore, this formed part of the rationale for the war.

Although most research has frequently mentioned the role of Israel and its relationship with the US as an undeclared reason for the war, it may have only played a minor part in influencing the decision for war. Some research has established a link between US military support for Israel and Israeli support of US regional policies. The US maintains a positive relationship with Israel, since Israel is a strategic asset for the US in the region and can advance US interests, such as supporting the mobility of US forces (Zunes, 2006: 2). The US also possibly believed that as it had closely related interests with Israel, the war on Iraq would serve to contain and restrict terrorists in the region, who presented a significant challenge to US and Israeli interests (Record, 2008: 84).

In accordance with the assumption of the importance of the alleged undeclared reasons for the war, it is argued that oil was the primary undeclared reason for the war and that the other undeclared reasons also played a role in the US rationale for the war. However, the undeclared reasons can only be partially verified.

3.2. Assumption: The Declared Reasons of Iraq’s Alleged WMD and its Alleged Link to Al Qaeda Were Not Credible and Iraq Did Not Pose an Immediate Threat to the US and its Allies.

Most research maintains that Iraq did not pose an imminent threat to the US. Despite the fact that the US believed that military force was necessary to contain the alleged threat, there was no credible evidence that Iraq constituted a more immediate threat to US national security, or to Middle East stability. Pfiffner (2004: 29) confirms that there was neither any evidence indicating that the Iraqi regime had plans to attack the US in the near term or that it possessed WMD. The 1991 Gulf War, the sanctions regime and the weapons inspections by UNSCOM, yielded significant progress in dismantling Iraq’s WMD and in preventing Iraq from reconstituting its WMD programmes. Various reports and statements by UNSCOM, UNMOVIC and the IAEA assert that the majority of Iraq’s proscribed weapons material was destroyed during the 1990s. Moreover, in the lead up to the war, UNMOVIC indicated that no prohibited items or activities were uncovered (UNMOVIC, 2003c). However, as mentioned in the previous section, UNMOVIC did acknowledge that Iraq had a history of avoiding disclosures of its WMD programmes, which suggests a possibility that Iraq could have posed a threat to the US in the long term. Nevertheless, the IAEA (2003) confirmed that no evidence was found of the revival of a nuclear weapons programme in Iraq.

Largely, the US and UK intelligence agencies focused on Iraq’s capabilities in 1991 as a benchmark to estimate its WMD programme in 2003. Despite US concerns, Iraq would have been unable to contemplate hostile action against the US in 2003. Record (2008: 79) implied that if the US believed that Iraq constituted a long term threat, it wanted to initiate military action before Iraq’s military balance of power was altered over the long term. Therefore, a preventative war would hamper any efforts by Iraq towards nuclear proliferation.

Despite a lack of evidence to support the US claim of Iraq's alleged links to Al Qaeda, the US was probably concerned about a repetition of 9/11, possibly conducted with WMD. Record (2008: 67, 68) suggested that had Hussein possessed WMD, the possibility existed that Iraq could have supplied terrorist groups with WMD, given Iraq's long standing enmity with the US and its previous track record of collaboration with terrorist groups, all however minor. However, Pollack (2002: 155) asserted that Hussein was unlikely to provide WMD to terrorists that were not under his control since there would be no incentive for Iraq to proliferate nuclear capability status and since Hussein did not trust international terrorists. Bullock (2003: 32) refuted the link since Al Qaeda's Osama bin Laden was a Sunni Muslim of an extreme fundamentalist persuasion whilst Hussein was a secular pan-Arabist, who would have had little to gain had he decided to attack the US through Al Qaeda. Overall, the linkages between Iraq and Al Qaeda were weak and there was no evidence relating to a close connection. Moreover, the 9/11 Commission found no collaborative relationship between the two (US National Commission, 2004: 66).

As there were no major debates surrounding the credibility of the US declared reason of the promotion of democracy in Iraq, this reason was credible in view of the benefits that the democratisation of Iraq could yield in that country as well as in the region. This reason was frequently emphasised in various speeches and addresses by Bush and senior Administration officials in the period leading up to the war. Ottaway (2005b: 174) confirms that while the authoritarian structures in Arab countries generally serve to fuel recruitment efforts for Al Qaeda, the US believed that democratic governments would curb terrorist recruitment efforts. Therefore, the promotion of democracy in Iraq was a credible reason for the US since it believed democracy could change Iraq from an aggressor into a peaceful state and possibly inspire other countries in the region to implement similar reforms.

This assumption can be verified since there was no credible evidence to support the US claims relating to Iraq's alleged WMD and its alleged links to Al Qaeda. Furthermore, there was no evidence to suggest that Iraq posed an immediate threat to the US. However, it can be verified that the declared reason of the promotion of democracy was credible.

3.3. Assumption: The First Gulf War and the 11 September 2001 Terrorist Attacks in the US Provided a Context for the 2003 Gulf War.

Following the 9/11 attacks in the US, the US redefined its foreign policy in order to address threats it faced in the international system. Angstrom (2005: 9) confirms that the 9/11 incidents seemingly encouraged the US to employ military force and war as instruments to deter perceived and potential attacks against the US homeland. The 2002 US National Security Strategy illustrates how the US adapted its approach to eliminate threats that it faced from its adversaries. Most research has implied that following the 2001 invasion of Afghanistan, the US believed that to deter other potential aggressors, another war was necessary and therefore unilateralism became the means by which it would assert its political influence and military power. It is in this context that the 9/11 incidents provided the US with a framework to retaliate against its enemies, and provided opportunities for Bush to implement policies that otherwise would not have been carried out. Furthermore, the 9/11 incidents could also be linked to the declared reason of the promotion of democracy in the Middle East.

Hallenberg (2004: 25 29) confirms that the US concluded that the authoritarian nature of most Arab regimes fueled terrorist recruitment. Consequently, the US linked terrorism to the absence of democracy in Arab countries, and drew parallels between the absence of democracy in the Arab world to the rejection of US foreign policy in the region. Therefore, the US believed that through the promotion of democracy, the “roots of terrorism” would be eliminated.

The 1991 Gulf War was clearly fought to contain Hussein’s regional ambitions, and largely to ensure that Kuwait’s oil would remain on the world market. Most research maintains that the US drive for the 2003 Gulf War emanated from the 1991 Gulf War. It would appear that declared and undeclared reasons that featured in the US-led 1991 and 2003 wars, are largely similar and that both wars were motivated by the US need to contain Iraq militarily (declared reason) as well as to ensure the uninterrupted supply of oil to the world market (undeclared reason). Both Gulf Wars illustrate the US approach to security related matters and the US conviction that US military participation can resolve regional security issues.

Overall, it is argued that the First Gulf War and the 9/11 incidents provided the US with a pretext to launch the Second Gulf War against Iraq. The 9/11 incidents provided the US with a foundation to link the issue of WMD with Iraq's non-compliance of UNSC resolutions as a way to turn the war on terrorism against Iraq. Moreover, the US successfully converted public outrage over the 9/11 terrorist attacks into a case for war against Iraq.

Therefore, the assumption that the 1991 Gulf War and the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the US provided a context for the 2003 Gulf War, can be verified.

4. CONCLUSION

The war against Iraq generated significant hostility against the US in the international community at large, in view of the US tendency to impose its power and geo-political influence. Since the US defines its interests in terms of its national security and economic interests, it seems that the undeclared reasons constituted important objectives of the war, and therefore, this may explain why the US pursued a unilateral approach, since multilateralism would dictate that the US follow the norms of the international system and gain explicit approval from the UNSC before initiating military action (Evans, 2005: 34).

The primary undeclared reason (or underlying motive) of securing access to Iraqi oil required that the US military forces gain control over Iraqi territory to place Iraq's oil industry under US and UK control, which would ensure that US and UK corporate interests benefit from oil industry related projects and other opportunities.

The following two tables illustrate the order of importance of and the credibility (from high to low) of the declared reasons and the alleged undeclared reasons, for the US decision to invade Iraq.

The Declared Reasons	The Importance of the Declared Reasons to the US	The Credibility of the Declared Reasons
1. Iraq's alleged WMD	Very important	Low
2. Iraq's alleged links to Al Qaeda	Very important	Low
3. The promotion of democracy in Iraq	Important	High

The Alleged Undeclared Reasons	The Importance of the Alleged Undeclared Reasons to the US	The Credibility of the Alleged Undeclared Reasons (as covered by research)
1. The US interest to secure access to Iraqi oil reserves	High importance	High
2. Securing US hegemony and dominance in the region	Important	Medium
3. Serving the interests of the US military-industrial complex	Important	Low
4. Preventing a regional threat to Israel	Moderately important	Low

Therefore, Table I illustrates that all three declared reasons played a part in the US case for the war against Iraq, and despite the fact that the reasons of Iraq's alleged WMD and its alleged links to Al Qaeda were not substantiated, the promotion of democracy was a credible reason. Table II illustrates that the primary alleged undeclared reason was the US interest in oil, and that the other

alleged undeclared reasons were considered somewhat less important. Since research has established a link between the US interests in the region's oil and the war, the undeclared reason of the US interest in Iraqi oil has high credibility. With regard to the undeclared reasons where research has not established a decisive link between the reasons and the war, the reasons are classified as having lower credibility.

Table III illustrates the correlation between the declared and the alleged undeclared reasons for the war against Iraq, and the particular reasons and motives of war in general identified in chapter two. The declared and the alleged undeclared reasons for the Iraq war are correlated with the causes of war (which include trigger, underlying, efficient and permissive causes); conscious and unconscious motives, as well as the reasons for war. In keeping with the above, the declared reasons for going to war may typically include those reasons that a state puts forward to justify a war. In the case of the 2003 Iraq war, the US claimed that Iraq possessed WMD, which could possibly be used to threaten international peace and security. Undeclared reasons refer more specifically to those reasons that a state may not wish to disclose since they may not justify war for instance the alleged undeclared US reason of seeking to gain access to Iraqi oil. As explained in chapter two, underlying causes refer to structural elements in the international system, such as the absence of a mechanism to prevent war, that allow war to occur but do not necessarily cause war. Underlying causes of war also include human nature as well as the nation state system where different interests drive individuals and states to compete with other respective individuals and states. Therefore, these causes reinforce the expectation of violence and a sense of insecurity, allowing war to occur. Trigger causes of war include incidents or actions that provoke a state to go to war and usually these events play out in a short period of time and may include an assassination plot by another state or the discovery of overt military activities. There were no immediate trigger causes for the 2003 war against Iraq since there was no sudden event or action perpetrated by Iraq to trigger the war. However, the US and UK intelligence reports indicated that Iraq posed an imminent nuclear threat, and this seemed to trigger the war against Iraq. Therefore, the allegation that Iraq posed an imminent nuclear threat can be considered to have been a trigger cause.

Efficient causes are connected to the particular circumstances surrounding individual wars, and war may therefore result due to certain ambitions and objectives of a nation state, such as the alleged US interest to gain control of Iraq's oil. Permissive causes are features that exist in the international system that do not promote war but allow it to occur, namely the system of international anarchy. Therefore, it can be argued that the reigning features in the international system allowed the US to pursue its alleged undeclared reasons for the war. In terms of conscious and unconscious motives, conscious motives refer to the deliberate decision by a leader to go to war (after rationalising that war is a useful tool to implement various political, economic and military objectives), whereas unconscious motives refer to motives that the leader is not immediately aware of. The alleged undeclared reasons are considered to have been motives, since they influenced the US decision to go to war with Iraq. Often, the undeclared reasons for war may be similar to the motives for war. Those undeclared reasons with a high credibility, as illustrated in Table II, can be considered to be conscious motives, whilst those with a low credibility are considered to be partially conscious and partially unconscious motives.

The reasons for war are more specific than causes, and can apply to the various interests a state has in an individual country or to the political and economic dynamics in a region. Therefore, each state will have different reasons for going to war, depending upon its interests as well as its domestic and foreign policy. Largely, the reasons for war include material reasons such as natural and industrial resources, security, post-industrial resources and arms races as well as poverty; social reasons for instance the domestic structure of a state and ethnicity, and lastly cultural reasons such as religion. With regard to the 2003 Iraq war, the alleged undeclared reasons had some material or tangible value. Therefore, the US alleged interest in Iraqi oil can be classified as a material reason (an interest by the US to acquire a natural resource from Iraq) for the war while the US interest to secure dominance in the region can be considered as a material reason with a security related dimension (to advance US national security in the international system).

Primarily, Table III illustrates that the declared reasons were calculated and conscious decisions by the US, while the undeclared reasons were motives, since they are considered as additional factors which influenced the decision to go to war.

Table III: Correlation of the Declared and the Alleged Undeclared Reasons to the General Causes, Motives and Reasons for War.			
The Declared and Alleged Undeclared Reasons	Causes of War: Triggers and Underlying Causes	Conscious and Unconscious Motives for war	Reasons for War
1. Iraq's alleged WMD	Underlying cause and trigger: The US perceived an imminent threat from Iraq (as indicated by intelligence reports).		Material interests (security and arms race)
2. Iraq's alleged links to Al Qaeda	Underlying cause and trigger: The US perceived a link between Iraq and Al Qaeda.		Material interests (security)
3. The promotion of democracy in Iraq	Underlying cause		Social and cultural reasons (domestic structure of states and democracies)
4. The US interest to secure access to Iraqi oil	Efficient and permissive causes (connected to particular circumstances surrounding individual wars)	Conscious motive	Material interests (natural and industrial resources)
5. Securing US hegemony	Efficient and permissive causes	Conscious motive	Material interests (security, post-

and dominance in the region			industrial resources and arms race)
6. Serving the interests of the US military-industrial complex	Efficient and permissive causes	Partially conscious and partially unconscious motive	Material interests (industrial resources)
7. Preventing a regional threat to Israel	Efficient and permissive causes	Partially conscious and partially unconscious motive	Social and political reasons

Both declared and undeclared reasons, therefore, seem to have formed the basis for the decision to invade Iraq, although the declared reasons tended to continue shifting and were largely not credible.

ABSTRACT

Topic: An Analysis of the Declared and Undeclared Reasons for the Second Gulf War

By: Angelika Karolina Milewski

Study Leader: Prof. M. Hough

Department: Political Sciences, University of Pretoria

Degree: Master of Security Studies (MSS)

The dissertation aims to explore the declared and the alleged undeclared reasons for the Second Gulf War (2003), against the background of the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks in the US. To achieve the aim of the study, the research commenced with a conceptual framework of the causes, reasons and motives for war. The framework not only identifies the various type of wars, but also distinguishes between the general causes of, and specific reasons for war within the context of realist, liberal and conservative theories. To analyse the context of the 2003 US-led war with Iraq, the study explores the reasons why Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990, and how this invasion ultimately resulted in the US participation in the 1991 Gulf War against Iraq. Following from this, the study identifies certain reasons/factors emanating from the 1991 Gulf War that may have influenced the US decision-making process in the lead up to the 2003 war against Iraq.

Mainly, the study explores the three declared reasons for the war as well as the intelligence failures by the US and the UK intelligence agencies, especially the incorrect assessments of Iraq WMD capabilities and related programmes, which consequently resulted in the US-led campaign against Iraq. Although most of the declared US reasons of Iraq's alleged WMD and its alleged links to Al Qaeda could not be substantiated, the study argues that these were important factors in building a case for the war.

Lastly, the study explores the alleged undeclared reasons for the Iraq war, and suggests that oil seems to have been an important factor which led the US to war.

Key Terminology

Al Qaeda	National Security
Declared Reasons	Oil
Democracy in Iraq	Terrorism
Gulf War 1991	Undeclared Reasons
Gulf War 2003	United States of America
Hegemony	Weapons of Mass Destruction
Intelligence Failures	
Kuwait	
Middle East	

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. PRIMARY SOURCES

IAEA. International Atomic Energy Agency. 7 April 1999. “Seventh Consolidated Progress Report of the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency on Iraq”. Presented to the President of the UN Security Council. Available at:

<http://www.iaea.org/OurWork/SV/Invo/statements.html>. Accessed on 5 June 2009.

IAEA. International Atomic Energy Agency. 14 April 2003. “Fifteenth Consolidated Progress Report of the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency on Iraq”. Presented to the President of the UN Security Council. Available at:

<http://www.iaea.org/OurWork/SV/Invo/statements.html>. Accessed on 5 June 2009.

IEA. International Energy Agency. November 2002. “World Energy Outlook”. Economic Analysis Division. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Paris Cedex. Available at: http://www.iae.org/publications/free_new_descasp?PUBS_ID=1090.

Accessed on 10 March 2011.

UK. Intelligence and Security Committee. “Iraqi Weapons of Mass Destruction – Intelligence and Assessments”. Presented to Parliament by the Prime Minister by Command of Her Majesty, September 2003. Pp 51 – 57. Available at: <http://www.official-documents.gov.uk/documents..>

Accessed on 11 March 2009.

UN Security Council. Resolution 678 of 29 November 1990. S/RES/678 (1990) S/22033.

Adopted by the Security Council at its 2963th Meeting. Available at:

<http://www.fas.org/news/un/iraq/sres/sres0678.htm>. Accessed on 23 March 2008.

UN Security Council. Resolution 1284 of 17 December 1999. S/RES/1284 (1991). 99-39609 (E) 171299. Adopted by the Security Council at its 4084th Meeting. Available at:

<http://www.un.org/depts/unscom/kerresolutions/sres99-1284.htm>. Accessed on 23 March 2008.

UN Security Council. Resolution 1441 of 8 November 2002. S/RES/1441 (2002). 0268226, (E) Adopted by the Security Council at its 4644th Meeting. Available at:
<http://www.un.org/depts/unscom/kerresolutions/sres99-1441.htm>. Accessed on 23 March 2008.

UN. Security Council. Resolution 1483 of 22 May 2003. The Establishment of the Development Fund for Iraq. 0336853 Adopted by the Security Council at its 4761th Meeting. Available at:
<http://www.un.org/depts/unscom/resolutions/03.htm>. Accessed on 23 March 2008.

UN. UNMOVIC, 19 December 2002. “Notes for the United Nations Security Council Briefing”. Dr H Blix, Executive Chairman, United Nations Monitoring and Verification Commission (UNMOVIC). Available at: <http://www.unmovic.org>. Accessed on 23 March 2008.

UN. UNMOVIC, 9 January 2003 (a). “Notes for the United Nations Security Council Briefing”. Dr H Blix, Executive Chairman, United Nations Monitoring and Verification Commission (UNMOVIC). Available at: <http://www.unmovic.org>. Accessed on 23 March 2008.

UN. UNMOVIC, 27 January 2003 (b). “Notes for the United Nations Security Council Briefing”. Dr H Blix, Executive Chairman, United Nations Monitoring and Verification Commission (UNMOVIC). Available at: <http://www.unmovic.org>. Accessed on 23 March 2008.

UN. UNMOVIC, 14 February 2003 (c). “Notes for the United Nations Security Council Briefing”. Dr H Blix, Executive Chairman, United Nations Monitoring and Verification Commission (UNMOVIC). Available at:
<http://www.iraqwatch.org/un/unmovic-blix-briefing-140203.htm>. Accessed on 23 March 2008

UN. UNMOVIC. 6 March 2003 (d). “Unresolved Disarmament Issues: Iraq’s Proscribed Weapons Programmes”. Working Document. Global Security Org. Available at:
http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/news/iraq/un/index_unmovic.htm. Accessed on 2 February 2006.

UN. UNMOVIC, 7 March 2003 (e). “Notes for the United Nations Security Council Briefing”. Dr H Blix, Executive Chairman, United Nations Monitoring and Verification Commission (UNMOVIC). Available at: <http://www.unmovic.org>. Accessed on 23 March 2008.

US. Central Intelligence Agency. October 2002. “Key Judgments from the National Intelligence Estimate on Iraq’s Continuing Programs for Weapons of Mass Destruction”. Available at: <http://www.ceip.org/files/projects/npp/pdf/iraq/declassifiedintellreport/pdf>. Accessed on 23 March 2008.

US. Central Intelligence Agency. George J. Tenet, Director of Central Intelligence. 5 February 2004. “Iraq and Weapons of Mass Destruction”. Remarks as prepared for delivery by Director of Central Intelligence George J. Tenet at Georgetown University. Available at: http://www.cia.gov/cia/public_affairs/speeches/2004/tent_georgetownspeech_02052. Accessed on 31 March 2007.

US. Coalition Provisional Authority. 20 December 2003. “Foreign Investment”. CPA Official Documents. Consolidated Press Office, DTIC. Available at: <http://www.iraqcoalition.org/index.html>. Accessed on 10 August 2010.

US. Coalition Provisional Authority. 10 February 2004 (a). “Iraqi Inspectors General”. CPA Official Documents. Consolidated Press Office, DTIC. Available at <http://www.iraqcoalition.org/regulations/>. Accessed on 10 August 2010.

US. Coalition Provisional Authority. 27 June 2004 (b). “Status of the CPA, MNF1, Certain Missions and Personnel”. CPA Official Documents. Consolidated Press Office, DTIC. Available at: <http://www.iraqcoalition.org/regulations/>. Accessed on 10 August 2010.

US. Congress. 26 October 2001. “Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism” United States Patriot Act, 2001. Pub. L. No. 107-56, 115 Stat. 273 (signed into law 26 October 2001). Library of Congress. Available at: <http://www.loc.gov/index.html>. Accessed on 13 February 2006.

US. Congress. 27 November 2002. Public. Law. No. 107-306. 116 Stat. 2383 (signed into law 27 November 2002). Library of Congress. Available at:
<http://www.archives.gov/legislative/research/9-11/public-law-107-306.pdf>. Accessed on 13 February 2006.

US. Department of Defence. Office of the Secretary of Defence. 13 October 2005. “Measuring Stability and Security in Iraq”. Report to Congress in Accordance with H.R. 1268, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defence, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief. Public Law 109-13 Washington DC. Available at:
http://www.defense.gov/pubs/20051013_publication_OSSRF.pdf. Accessed on 24 November 2010.

US. Department of Defence. Office of the Secretary of Defence. 30 November 2006. “Measuring Stability and Security in Iraq”. Report to Congress in Accordance with the Department of Defense Appropriations Act 2007. Section 9010, Public Law 109-289. Washington DC. Available at: http://www.defense.gov/home/features/iraq_reports/index.html. Accessed on 24 November 2010.

US. Department of Defence. Office of the Secretary of Defence. March 2010. “Measuring Stability and Security in Iraq”. Report to Congress in Accordance with the Department of Defense Supplemental Appropriations Act 2008. Section 9204, Public Law 110 252. Washington DC. Available at: http://www.defense.gov/home/features/iraq_reports/index.html. Accessed on 24 November 2010.

US. Department of Energy. May 2001 (a). “National Energy Policy: Reliable, Affordable and Environmentally Sound Energy For America’s Future”. Report of the National Energy Policy Development Group. Available at: <http://ne.doe.gov/pdffiles/National-Energy-Policy.pdf>. Accessed on 10 June 2010.

US. Department of Energy. Energy Information Administration. 21 December 2001 (b). “Annual Energy Outlook 2002 with Projections to 2020”. (0383). Available at: <http://www.eia.gov/oiaf/archive/ieo02/index.html>. Accessed on 10 June 2010.

US. Department of Energy. Energy Information Administration. Office of Integrated Analysis and Forecasting. 26 March 2002. “International Energy Outlook 2002”. (0484/2002). Available at: <http://www.eia.gov/oiaf/archive/ieo02/oil.html>. Accessed on 10 June 2010.

US. Department of Energy. Energy Information Administration. January 2003 (a). “Iraq Background, Country Analysis Brief: Iraq Energy Data, Statistics and Analysis – Oil, Gas, Electricity, Coal”. Available at: <http://www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/cabs/Iraq/Background.html>. Accessed on 8 July 2003.

US. Department of Energy. Energy Information Administration. Office of Integrated Analysis and Forecasting. May 2003 (b). “International Energy Outlook 2003”. (0484/2003). Available at: <http://www.eia.gov/oiaf/archive/ieo02/oil.html>. Accessed on 10 June 2010.

US. Department of Energy. Energy Information Administration. September 2010. “Iraq Energy Profile: Country Energy Data and Analysis”. Independent Statistics and Analysis. Available at: <http://tonto.eia.doe.gov/countries/cab.cfm?fips=iz>. Accessed on 10 February 2011.

US. George Bush Presidential Library and Museum. President G. H. W. Bush. 30 August 1990 (a). “News Conference on the Persian Gulf Crisis”. Public Papers. Texas. US. Available at: http://www.bushlibrary.tamu.edu/research/papers_public.phpid=2189year-19908. Accessed on 7 November 2010.

US. George Bush Presidential Library and Museum. President G. H. W. Bush. 11 September 1990 (b). “Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the Persian Gulf Crisis and the Federal Budget Deficit”. Public Papers. Texas. US. Available at: http://www.bushlibrary.tamu.edu/research/papers_public.phpid=2217year-19909. Accessed on 7 November 2010.

US. George Bush Presidential Library and Museum. President G. H. W. Bush. 14 January 1991
(a). “Statement on Signing the Resolution Authorizing the Use of Military Force Against Iraq”.

Texas. US. Available at:

http://www.bushlibrary.tamu.edu/research/papers_public.phpid=2620year-199101. Accessed on 7 November 2010.

US. George Bush Presidential Library and Museum. President G. H. W. Bush. 18 January 1991
(b). “News Conference on the Persian Gulf Conflict”. Texas. US. Available at:

http://www.bushlibrary.tamu.edu/research/papers_public.phpid=2632year-199011. Accessed on 7 November 2010.

US. George Bush Presidential Library and Museum. President G. H. W. Bush. 29 January 1991
(c). “State of the Union Address”. Texas. US. Available at:

http://www.bushlibrary.tamu.edu/research/papers_public.php/year199. Accessed on 7 November 2010.

US. National Archives and Record Administration. (NARA) 28 May 2003. “The President. Executive Order 13303. Protecting the Development Fund for Iraq and Certain other Property in which Iraq has an Interest”. Federal Register Volume 68. No 102. Available at:

<http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2003/05/print/20030522-15.html>.

Accessed on 24 November 2010.

US. National Commission on the Terrorist Attacks on the United States. 20 August 2004. “The 9/11 Commission Report”. Final Report of the National Commission on the Terrorist Attacks on the United States. US Government Printing Office. Washington DC. Available at:

<http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/911/report/index.htm>, Accessed on 5 June 2009.

US. National Security Council. September 2002. “National Security Strategy of the United States”. Available at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.html>. Accessed on 14 May 2004.

US. Whitehouse. Colin Powell. 5 February 2003. “Address to the UN General Assembly on Iraq’s Weapons of Mass Destruction”. UN General Assembly. Available at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/02/20030205.html>. Accessed on 13 February 2006.

US. Whitehouse. Condoleezza Rice. 23 January 2003. “Why We Know Iraq is Lying”. Column by Dr Rice. New York Times. Available at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/01/20030123.html>. Accessed on 23 March 2008.

US. Whitehouse. George. W. Bush. 20 January 2001. “Inauguration Address”. Available at: <http://www.whitehouse.georgewbush.org/news/2001/012001>. Accessed on 23 March 2011.

US. Whitehouse. George. W. Bush. 28 January 2002 (a). “State of the Union”. Available at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/01/20030128-1.html>. Accessed on 23 March 2008.

US. Whitehouse. George. W. Bush. 12 September 2002 (b). “Remarks to the UN General Assembly”. New York. Available at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/09/20020912-1.html>. Accessed on 13 February 2006.

US. Whitehouse. George. W. Bush. 14 September 2002 (c). “Address to the Nation on the Growing Danger Posed by Saddam Hussein’s Regime”. Available at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/09/20020914.html>. Accessed on 23 March 2008.

US. Whitehouse. George. W. Bush. 19 September 2002 (d). “Remarks by the President in Photo Opportunity with Secretary of State Colin Powell”. Available at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/09/20020919.html>. Accessed on 23 March 2008.

US. Whitehouse. George. W. Bush. 5 October 2002 (e). “Address to the Nation: Iraqi Regime Danger to America is Grave and Growing”. Available at:
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/10/20020510.html>. Accessed on 23 March 2008.

US. Whitehouse. George. W. Bush. 7 October 2002 (f). “President Bush Outlines the Iraqi Threat”. Remarks by President Bush at the Cincinnati Museum Center. Cincinnati Union Terminal. Available at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/10/20021007.html>. Accessed on 23 March 2008.

US. Whitehouse. George. W. Bush. 28 January 2003 (a). “State of the Union”. Available at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/01/20030128-1.html>. Accessed on 13 February 2006.

US. Whitehouse. George. W. Bush. 26 February 2003 (b). “President Discusses the Future of Iraq”. Available at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/02/20030226.html>. Accessed on 23 March 2008.

US. Whitehouse. George. W. Bush. 17 March 2003 (c). “Address to the Nation on War with Iraq”. Remarks in Washington DC. Available at:
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/03/20030317-8.html>. Accessed on 13 February 2006.

US. Whitehouse. George. W. Bush. 19 March 2003 (d). “Address to the Nation”. Available at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/03/20030319.html>. Accessed on 23 March 2008.

US. Whitehouse. George. W. Bush. 31 March 2003 (e). “President Updates America on Operations Liberty Shield and Iraqi Freedom”. Available at:
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/03/20030331.html>. Accessed on 23 March 2008.

US. Whitehouse. George. W. Bush. 3 May 2003 (f). “President Bush and Prime Minister Howard of Australia Discuss Operation Iraqi Freedom”. Available at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/05/20030503-1.html>. Accessed on 23 March 2008.

US. Whitehouse. George. W. Bush. 23 September 2003 (g). “Address to the United Nations General Assembly”. Available at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/09/20030923-1.html>. Accessed on 23 March 2008.

US. Whitehouse. President B. Obama. “Remarks by the President on a New Beginning”. 4 June 2009. Remarks at the Cairo University. Cairo. Egypt. Office of the Press Secretary. Available at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-cairo-university-60409>. Accessed on 7 November 2010.

US. Whitehouse. Presidential Commission on the Intelligence Capabilities of the United States Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction. 31 March 2005. “Report to the President of the United States”. Washington DC. Available at: <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/wmd/index.html>. Accessed on 16 December 2010.

2. SECONDARY SOURCES

2.1. Books

Ali. T. 2003. Bush in Babylon. The Recolonization of Iraq. Bath Press. Verso. London.

Adb Al-Jabbar. F. 1991 “The Gulf War and Ideology: The Double Edged Sword of Islam”. in Bresheeth. H. & Davis. N. (Eds). The Gulf War and the New World Order. Zed Books LTD. London.

Angstrom. J. 2004. “Puzzles and Propositions of the Iraq War” in Hallenberg. J & Karlsson. (Eds). The Iraq War: European Perspectives on Policies, Strategies and Operations: Case Series. Contemporary Security Studies. Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. London and New York.

Barber. B. R. 2005. “Democracy in the Gulf? Challenges and Opportunities” in The Gulf Challenges of the Future. The Emirates Centre for Strategic Studies and Research. Abu Dhabi.

Baylis. J. and Wirtz. J. 2007. “Introduction” in Baylis. J. Wirtz. J. et al (Eds). Strategy in the Contemporary World: An Introduction to Strategic Studies. 2nd Edition. Oxford University Press. New York.

Beier. J.M. 2008. “Thinking and Rethinking the Causes of War” in Snyder. C. (Ed). Contemporary Security and Strategy. Palgrave Macmillan. UK.

Blix. H. 2005. Disarming Iraq: The Search for Weapons of Mass Destruction. Bloomsbury Publishing. London.

Brilmayer. L. 1994. American Hegemony: Political Morality in A One Superpower World. Yale University. Vail-Ballou Press. Binghamton. New York.

Brody. R. 1994. “Crisis, War, and Public Opinion” in Bennet. W. & Paletz. D. (Eds). Taken by Storm: The Media, Public Opinion and US Foreign Policy in the Gulf War. The University of Chicago Press. Chicago.

Bromley. S. 2008. American Power and the Prospects for International Order. Polity Press. Cambridge. London.

Brown. S. 1994. The Causes and Prevention of War. St Martins Press. Inc. New York.

Brunn. D. S. 2004. 11 September and its Aftermath: The Geopolitics of Terror. Frank Cass Publishers. London.

Chomsky. N. 1991. “The US in the Gulf Crisis” in Bresheeth. H. & Davis. N. (Eds). The Gulf War and the New World Order. Zed Books LTD. London.

Cohen. E. 2007. “Technology and Warfare” in Baylis. J. Wirtz. J. et al (Eds). Strategy in the Contemporary World: An Introduction to Strategic Studies. 2nd Edition. Oxford University Press. New York.

Cordesman. A. 2004. Energy Developments in the Middle East. Center for Strategic and International Studies. Praeger Publishers. Washington DC.

Cordesman. A. and Al-Rodhan. K. R. March 2006 (a). The Global Oil Market: Risks and Uncertainties. Center for Strategic and International Studies. Praeger Publishers. Washington DC.

Cordesman. A. and Al-Rodhan. K.R. 2006 (b). The Changing Dynamics of Energy in the Middle East. Volume 1. Center for Strategic and International Studies. Praeger Publishers. Washington DC.

Dannreuther. R. 2007. International Security: The Contemporary Agenda. Polity Publishers. Cambridge. UK.

De Jonge Oudraat. C. 2004. “The Role of the Security Council” in Boulden. J. & Weiss. G. (Eds). Terrorism and the UN: Before and After September 11. Indiana University Press. North Morton Street. Bloomington and Indianapolis.

Dorman. W. and Livingston. S. 1994. “News and Historical Content: The Establishing Phase of the Persian Gulf Policy Debate” in Bennet. W. & Paletz. D. (Eds). Taken by Storm: The Media, Public Opinion and US Foreign Policy in the Gulf War. The University of Chicago Press. Chicago.

Evans. G. 2005. “Shifting Security Parameters in the 21st Century” in The Gulf Challenges of the Future. The Emirates Centre for Strategic Studies and Research. Abu Dhabi.

Feldman. N. 2004. What We Owe Iraq: War and Ethics of Nation Building. Princeton University Press. London.

Freeman. A. 1991. “The Economic Background and Consequences of the Gulf War” in Bresheeth. H. & Davis. N. (Eds). The Gulf War and the New World Order. Zed Books LTD. London.

Garnett. J. C. 1992. “States, State Centric Perspectives and Interdependence Theory” in Baylis. J. & Rengger. N. J. Dilemmas of World Politics: International Issues in a Changing World. Oxford University Press. New York.

Garnett. J. C. 2007. “The Causes of War and the Conditions of Peace” in Baylis. J. Wirtz. J. et al (Eds). Strategy in the Contemporary World: An Introduction to Strategic Studies. 2nd Edition. Oxford University Press. New York.

Gause. G. III. 1994. Oil Monarchies: Domestic and Security Challenges in the Arab Gulf States. Council on Foreign Relations Press. New York.

Goldman. J. R. 1987. American Security in a Changing World: Issues and Choices. Boston. University Press of America. Lanham. MD. Library of Congress Cataloging. US.

Hallenberg. J. 2004. “What Were the Bush Administration’s Goals in Invading Iraq?” in Hallenberg. J. & Karlsson. H. (Eds). The Iraq War: European Perspectives on Policies, Strategies and Operations: Case Series. Contemporary Security Studies. Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. London and New York.

Huldt. B. 2004. “The Iraq War and the Transatlantic Relationship” in Hallenberg. J. & Karlsson. H. (Eds). The Iraq War: European Perspectives on Policies, Strategies and Operations: Case

Series. Contemporary Security Studies. Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. London and New York.

Johnson. C. 2004. Blowback: The Costs and Consequences of American Empire. Metropolitan Books. Holt Paperbacks. New York.

Kaysen. C. Steinbruner. J. & Malin. M. B. 2002. "US National Security Policy: In Search of Balance" in Kaysen. C. et al. (Eds). War with Iraq: Costs, Consequences and Alternatives. American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Committee on International Security Studies. Cambridge.

Kemp. G. 2001. "Military Technology and Conflict" in Crocker. C. (Ed). Turbulent Peace: The Challenges of Managing International Conflict. United States Institute for Peace. Washington D.C.

Latham. A. 1999. "Re-imagining Warfare: The Revolution in Military Affairs" in Snyder. C. (Ed). Contemporary Security and Strategy. Macmillan Press LTD. London.

Lauterpacht. E. 1991. The Kuwait Crisis. Greenwood Macweller Publishers. London.

Lynn-Jones. S. 1999. "Realism and Security Studies" in Snyder. C. (Ed). Contemporary Security and Strategy. Macmillan Press LTD. London.

Lynn-Jones. S. 2008. "Realism and Security Studies" in Snyder. C. (Ed). Contemporary Security and Strategy. Palgrave Macmillan. UK.

Macfarlane. N. 2004. "Charter Values and the Response to Terrorism" in Boulden. J. & Weiss. G. (Eds) Terrorism and the UN: Before and After September 11. Indiana University Press. Bloomington and Indianapolis.

Mahnken. T. 2007. “Strategic Theory” in Baylis. J. Wirtz. J. et al (Eds). Strategy in the Contemporary World: An Introduction to Strategic Studies. 2nd Edition. Oxford University Press. New York.

Meernik. J.D. 2004. The Political Use of Military Force in U.S. Foreign Policy. Ashgate Publishing Limited. Gower House. Croft Road. Aldershot.

Miller. S. E. 2002. “Gambling on War: Force, Order and the Implications of Attacking Iraq.” In Kaysen et al. (Eds). War with Iraq: Costs, Consequences and Alternatives. American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Committee on International Security Studies. Cambridge.

Muravchik. J. 1992. Exporting Democracy: Fulfilling America’s Destiny. The AEI Press. American Enterprise Institute. Washington D.C.

Neale. J. 2004. What’s Wrong With America?: How the Rich and Powerful Have Changed America and Now Want to Change the World. Vision Paperbacks. Satin Publications Ltd. London.

Nelson. K. and Olin. S. 1979. Why War? Ideology, Theory and History. University of California Press. Berkeley and Los Angeles. California.

Ottaway. M. 2005 (a). “The Missing Constituency for Democratic Reform” in Carothers. T. & Ottaway. M. (Eds). Uncharted Journey. Promoting Democracy in the Middle East. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Washington D.C.

Ottaway. M. 2005 (b). “The Problem of Credibility” in Carothers. T. & Ottaway. M. (Eds). Uncharted Journey. Promoting Democracy in the Middle East. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Washington D.C.

Paris. R. 2003. “The Burden of Nation Building in Postwar Iraq” in Abrams. I. & Gungwu. W. (Eds). The Iraq War and Its Consequences. Thoughts of Nobel Peace Laureates and Eminent Scholars. World Scientific Publishing. Singapore.

Pollack. K. 2002. The Threatening Storm: The Case for Invading Iraq. Random House New York.

Preston. Z. 2003. The Crystallization of the Iraqi State: Geopolitical Function and Form. European Academic Publishers. Bern.

Rabasa. A. et al 2004. The Muslim World After 9/11. 2004. Rand Corporation. Santa Monica, CA.

Rabasa. A. et al. 2006 (a). Beyond Al Qaeda. The Global Jihadist Movement. Part One. Santa Monica. Rand Corporation. Prepared for United States Airforce. Santa Monica. CA.

Rabasa. A. et al. 2006 (b). Beyond Al Qaeda. The Outer Rings of Terrorist Universe. Part Two. Santa Monica. Rand Corporation. Prepared for United States Airforce. Santa Monica. CA.

Rummel. R. J. 1979. “Causes and Conditions of International Conflict and War” in Rummel. R. J. Understanding Conflict and War: Volume 4: War, Power and Peace. Sage Publications. California. US. Available at <http://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/WPP.CHAP16.HTM>. Accessed on 5 May 2009.

Sciolino. E. 1991. The Outlaw State: Saddam Hussein’s Quest for Power and the Gulf Crisis. John Wiley & Sons, INC. New York.

Sheehan. M. 2007. “The Evolution of Modern Warfare” in Baylis. J. Wirtz. J. et al (Eds). Strategy in the Contemporary World: An Introduction to Strategic Studies. 2nd Edition. Oxford University Press. New York.

Sheehan. M. 2008. “The Changing Character of War” in Baylis. J. Smith. S. et al (Eds). The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations. 4th Edition. Oxford University Press. New York.

Snyder. C. and Malik J. 1999. “Developments in Modern Warfare” in Snyder. C. (Ed). Contemporary Security and Strategy. Macmillan Press LTD. London.

Suganami. H. 1996. On the Causes of War. Oxford University Press. Oxford. New York.

Todorov. T. 2005. The New World Disorder: Reflections of a European. Translated from French by Brown. A. 2005. Polity Press Publishers. Cambridge. UK. Original work published in 2003 under the title Le Nouveau Desordre Mondial.

Tripp. C. 2002. A History of Iraq. Second Edition. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Venter. A. J. 2004. The Iraqi War Debrief: Why Saddam Hussein was Toppled. Earthbound Publications. Hermanus.

Vertzberger. Y. 1998. Risk Taking and Decision Making. Stanford University Press. Stanford. California.

Waltz. K. 1959. Man, the State and War. Colombia University Press. New York.

Williams. J. 2003. “Iraq and Preemptive Self-Defence” in Abrams. I & Gungwu. W. (Eds). The Iraq War and Its Consequences. Thoughts of Nobel Peace Laureates and Eminent Scholars. World Scientific Publishing. Singapore.

Yousif. S. 1991. “The Iraqi – US War: A Conspiracy Theory” in Bresheeth. H. & Davis. N. (Eds). The Gulf War and the New World Order. Zed Books LTD. London.

Ziegler. D. 2001. War, Peace and International Politics Harper Collins Publishers. Western Washington University. Washington DC.

Zinni. A. C. 2005. “The Impact of US Policy on Gulf Security: The Military Viewpoint” in The Gulf Challenges of the Future. The Emirates Centre for Strategic Studies and Research. Abu Dhabi.

2.2. Journals

Byman. D. and Pollack. K. July 2008. “Iraq’s Long Term Impact on Jihadist Terrorism”. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 618. Available at: <http://www//ann.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/618/1/55>. Accessed on 20 April 2010.

D’Amato. P. December 2000-January 2001. “US Intervention in the Middle East: Blood for Oil”. Issue 15. International Socialist Review. Available at: http://www.isreview.org/issues/15/blood_for_oil.html. Accessed on 7 January 2010.

Dillon. G. August 2002. The IAEA in Iraq: Past activities and Findings. The International Atomic Energy Agency Bulletin 44/2/2002. P 13 – 16. Available at: <http://www/iaeaorg/publications/magazines/bulletin/bull1442/articles.pdf>. Accessed on 20 March 2009.

Engdahl. F.W. June 2003. “A New American Century?: Iraq and the Hidden Euro Dollar Wars”. Current Concerns. No 4. Available at: <http://www.currentconcerns.ch/archive/2003/04/20030409.php>. Accessed on 20 June 2005.

Hammons. S. 31 October 2005. “Intelligence Failures Prior to 9/11, Iraq War: Planned Strategies?”. American Chronicle. Available at: <http://www.americanchronicle.com/articles/view/3367>. Accessed on 20 March 2007.

Hinnebusch. R. Spring 2007. “The American Invasion of Iraq: Causes and consequences”. Perceptions. Volume 12. Available at: http://www.sam.gov.tr/perceptions/volume12/Spring07_raymond.pdf. Accessed on 13 October 2010.

Isbell. P. 23 September 2002. "The Shifting Politics of the Euro". Zonas. No 57. Available at: <http://www.realinstitutoelcano.org/analisis/70.esp>. Accessed on 20 June 2005.

Kagan. R. September/October 2008. "The September 12 Paradigm: America, the World and George. W. Bush". Foreign Affairs: Volume 87. No 5. Available at: <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/63564/robert-kagan/the-september-12-paradigm>. Accessed on 20 March 2007.

Kruys. G. P. H. May 2006. "Intelligence Failures: Causes and Contemporary Case Studies". Strategic Review for Southern Africa Vol XXV, No 1.

Pfiffner. J. P. March 2004. "Did President Bush Mislead the Country in His Arguments for War with Iraq?". Presidential Studies Quarterly 34, No 1. Available at: <http://www.ethicsmgt.com/class/bushmislead.pdf>. Accessed on 16 July 2009.

Pollack. K. January/February 2004. "Spies, Lies, and Weapons: What Went Wrong". The Atlantic Monthly. Available at: http://www.brookings.edu/opinion/2003/0620iraq_pollack.aspx. Accessed on 20 April 2010.

Record. J. Summer 2008. "Why the Bush Administration Invaded Iraq: Making Strategy after 9/11". Strategic Studies Quarterly. Available at: <http://www.au.af.mil/au/ssq/2008/Summer/record.pdf>. Accessed on 20 April 2010.

Selfa. L. Spring 1999. "The 1991 Gulf War: Establishing a New World Order". International Socialist Review, Issue 7. Available at: <http://www.isreview.org/issues/07/1991gulfwar.html>. Accessed on 7 November 2010.

Waxman. D. 2009. "From Jerusalem to Baghdad? Israel and the War in Iraq". International Studies Perspectives. No 10. Available at: <http://www.baruchun.cuny.edu/wsas/academics.html>. Accessed on 11 March 2011.

Zeese. K. 9 May 2006. “The Corporate US Takeover of the Iraq Economy”. American Chronicle. Available at: <http://www.americanchronicle.com/articles/view/9276>. Accessed on 9 March 2011.

2.3. Media and Ad Hoc Publications

Baker Institute Study. April 2001. “Strategic Energy Policy Challenges for the 21st Century”. No 15. The Independent Task Force on Strategic Energy Policy: Challenges for the 21st Century. James A. Baker III. Institute for Public Policy of Rice University and the Council on Foreign Relations. Available at: http://www.bakerinstitute.org/publications/study_15.pdf. Accessed on 20 June 2005.

Blanchard. C. Katzman. K. et al. J. 12 January 2007. “Iraq: Regional Perspectives and US Policy”. Report for Congress, Congressional Research Service. Library of Congress. Washington D.C.

Bouillon. M. February 2007. “The Middle East: Fragility and Crisis. Coping with Crisis”. Working Paper Series. International Peace Academy. New York. Available at: http://www.ipinst.org/media/pdf/publications/cwc_working_paper_middle_east_mb_3.pdf. Accessed on 20 March 2009.

Bullock. D. R. 19 December 2003. “The Iraq War Discourse of President George W. Bush: Reconstituting the Soviet-Style Threat, Justifying American Power and Manifesting the Unipolar Worldview”. Communication 497 Honors Thesis. Professor Randall Lake. University of Southern California. Los Angeles.

Cirincione. J. Mathews. J. et al. A. January 2004. “Weapons of Mass Destruction in Iraq”. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Washington DC. Available at: <http://carnegieendowment.org/files/Iraq3FullText.pdf>. Accessed on 20 May 2008.

Cordesman. A. 19 January 2007. “Reconstruction in Iraq: The Uncertain Way Ahead”. Working Draft. Centre for Strategic and International Studies. 1800 K Street, N.W. Washington D.C.

Foster. J. B. July/August 2008. “Peak Oil and Energy Imperialism”. Monthly Review. No 60, 3. Available at: <http://www.monthlyreview.org/2008/07/01/peak-oil-and-energy-imperialism>. Accessed on 11 March 2011.

Halchin. E. L. 29 April 2004. “The Coalition Provisional Authority: Origins, Characteristics and Institutional Authorities”. RL32370. Report for Congress. Congressional Research Service. Library of Congress. Washington DC. Available at: <http://www.policyarchive.org/handle/10207/bitstreams/2030.pdf>. Accessed on 2 April 2011.

Indyk. M. Pollack. K. et al. M. 12 December 2002. “Iraq’s Declaration of Weapons of Mass Destruction”. Press Review. The Saban Centre for Middle East Policy. Brookings Institution. Washington DC. Available at: http://www.brookings.edu/opinion/2003/0620iraq_pollack.aspx. Accessed on 20 April 2010.

Iraq Survey Group. 2004 (a). Final Report: “Regime Strategic Intent” in Weapons of Mass Destruction. Volume 1. Available at: <http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/report/2004/isg-final-report/isg-finalreport>. Accessed on 10 January 2008.

Iraq Survey Group. 2004 (b). Final Report: “Regime Strategy and WMD Timeline Events: Delivery Systems” in Weapons of Mass Destruction. Volume 2. Available at: <http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/report/2004/isg-final-report/isg-finalreport>. Accessed on 10 January 2008.

Levich. J. December 2002. “Behind the Invasion of Iraq”. Aspects of India’s Economy. No 33 & 34. Special Issue: Behind the Invasion of Iraq. Available at: <http://www.rupe-india.org/34/behind.html>. Accessed on 13 October 2010.

Luft, G. 17 June 2004. “Iraq’s Oil Sector: One Year After Liberation”. Middle East Memo, No 4. Institute for the Analysis of Global Security. The Saban Centre for Middle East Policy. Brookings Institution. Washington DC. Available at:

http://www.brookings.edu/papers/2004/0617iraq_luft.aspx. Accessed on 13 October 2010.

Muravchik, J. 4 February 2005. “The Democratic Ideal”. American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. 1150 17th Street, N.W. Washington DC.

Available at: <http://www.aei.org/article/21836>. Accessed on 20 March 2007.

Paul, J. November 2003. “Oil Companies in Iraq: A Century of Rivalry and War”. Conference in Berlin on Corporate Accountability, 25 – 26 November 2003. Global Policy Forum. New York. Available at: <http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/oil/2003/2003companiesiniraq.htm>. Accessed on 15 June 2004.

Pollack, K. 7 February 2006. “A Switch in Time: A New Strategy for America in Iraq”. Analysis Paper, No 7. The Saban Centre for Middle East Policy. Brookings Institution. Washington DC.

Powers, G. 28 January 2003. “Ethical Analysis of War Against Iraq”. Special Report No 98, by Smock, D. Presentations by Powers, G. Royal, R. Hunsinger, G. & Thistlethwaite, S. on “Would an Invasion of Iraq be a Just War?”. 17 December 2002. United States Institute of Peace. Washington DC. Available at: <http://www.usip.org/publications/would-invasion-iraq-be-just-war>. Accessed on 4 February 2006.

Project for the New American Century (PNAC). 2000. “Rebuilding America’s Defences: Strategies, Forces and Resources for a New Century”. Washington DC. Available at: <http://www.newamericancentury.org/iraqclintonletter.htm>. Accessed on 25 November 2010.

Sharp, J.M. 15 June 2010. “US Foreign Assistance to the Middle East: Historical Background, Recent Trends and the FY 2011 Request”. Report for Congress. Congressional Research Service. Library of Congress. Washington DC. Available at:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RL32260.pdf>. Accessed on 7 November 2010.

Singer. P. W. 2007. “The 9-11 War Plus 5: Looking Back and Looking Forward at US-Islamic World Relations”. The Brookings Project on US Relations with the Islamic World. The Saban Centre for Middle East Policy. Brookings Institution. Washington DC.

3. Internet

Al Shayji. A. Dr. 4 August 2008. “Kuwait Invasion Changed Region”. Al Arabiya News Channel. Available at: <http://www.alarabiya.net/views/2008/08/04/54217.html>. Accessed on 21 July 2010.

American Patriot Friends Network. 1 July 2004. “Several Reasons Why Saddam Hussein Invaded Kuwait”. Available at: <http://www.apfn.org/saddam-hussein/kuwait.htm>. Accessed on 21 July 2010.

Beams. N. February 2003 (a). “Oil, Dollars, Euros, and Dead Iraqi’s”. Daily News Headlines Digest. Information Clearing House. Available at: <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article1554.html>. Accessed on 20 February 2011.

Beams. N. 24 March 2003 (b). “The US War Against Iraq: The Historical Issues”. World Socialist Web Site. International Committee of the Fourth International (ICFI). Available at: <http://www.wsws.org/articles/2003/mar2003/nbea-m24.html>. Accessed on 20 February 2011.

Beams. N. 14 April 2006. “The Iraq War and the Eruption of American Imperialism”. World Socialist Web Site. International Committee of the Fourth International (ICFI). Available at: <http://www.wsws.org/articles/2006/apr2006/bea1-a13.html>. Accessed on 20 February 2011.

Blankfort. J. and Plitnick. M. 28 July 2005. “On the Israeli Lobby: Myth and Reality, Jewish Influence on US Middle East Policy”. Zio Mania. Available at: <http://www.ziomania.com/whose%20war/whose%20war.htm>. Accessed on 11 April 2011.

Clark. W. March 2003. “The Real Reasons for the Upcoming War With Iraq: A Macroeconomic and Geostrategic Analysis of the Unspoken Truth”. Revised Essay. John Hopkins University. Baltimore. Available at: <http://www.radical.com/ratville/CAH/RRIraqwar.html>. Accessed on 20 February 2007.

Cooperman. G. 13 December 2004. “Beyond Peak Oil: A Survey Based on Primary Studies”. Available at: <http://www.ccs.neu.edu/home/gene/peakoil/peakoil.html>. Accessed on 6 June 2005.

Danner. M. 31 May 2007. “Words in a Time of War”. Available at: <http://www.markdanner.com/articles/show/130>. Accessed on 13 January 2008.

Ehrlich. A. and Gleick. P. 2000. Draft Background Paper for Working Group 5: Resources and Environmental Degradation as Sources of Conflict. 50th Pugwash Conference on Science and World Affairs: Eliminating the Causes of War. Queens College. Cambridge. UK. Available at: <http://www.pugwash.org/reports/pac256/WG5draft.htm>. Accessed on 5 May 2009.

Harrison. R. November/December 1993. “Saddam Hussein: Unwitting Godfather of the PLO Agreement”. Washington Report on the Middle East. Available at: <http://www.wrmea.com/backissues/1193/9311019.htm>. Accessed on 21 July 2010.

Hooshiyar. S. & Karimi. S. August 2005. “The U.S. Invasion of Iraq: Oil, the Mother of all Factors”. Iranreview.com. Available at: <http://iranreview.com/Editorials/US%20invasion.htm>. Accessed on 20 February 2007.

Institute for Research: Middle Eastern Policy, (IRMEP). 24 May 2004. “The U.S. Invasion of Iraq. One Year Later”. Policy on the Move. Podcast. E:\Middle East Academic Research and Exposition - Iraq - One Year Later. Available at: <http://www.irmep.org/Defaults.asp/http://www.irmep.org/measure2.htm>. Accessed on 20 May 2008.

Issa. L. 25 – 27 July 2008. “The Invasion of Kuwait: Reasons, Agents and Chances for Peace”. Background Paper. Hiroshima Meeting of the UNESCO Asian Arab Interregional Philosophical Dialogues. War and Peace Working Group. Available at: http://www.unescobkk.org/fileadmin/user_upload/shs/.../InvasionofKuwait.pdf. Accessed on 21 July 2010.

Juhasz. A. 20 January 2004. “Ambitions of Empire: The Bush Administration’s Economic Plan for Iraq (and Beyond)”. Global Policy Forum. New York. Available at: <http://www.globalsecurity.org/security/issues/iraq/after/2004/0120ambitions.htm>. Accessed on 20 March 2007.

Khaleel. A. 29 June 2005. “Why Did America Invade Iraq?”. Iraqi Articles. Available at: http://iraquna.blogspot.com/2005_06_01_iraquna_archive.html. Accessed on 20 February 2007.

Klare. M. 2003. “The US Invasion of Iraq Was Not Justified”. Sidebar. MSN. Encarta. Available at: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/3005585/Was-the-U-S-Invasion-on-Iraq-Justified>. Accessed on 20 March 2007.

Kretzmann. S. & Vallette. J. 28 July 2003. “Bush Gives Legal Immunity to Transnational Oil Corporations in Iraq”. Reclaim Democracy.Org. Published by Tom Paine.com. US. Available at: http://www.reclaimdemocracy.org/weekly_2003/oil_corporations_iraq_immunity.html. Accessed on 20 March 2007.

Miller. M. 2000. Draft Background Paper for Working Group 4: Poverty as a Cause of War. 50th Pugwash Conference on Science and World Affairs: Eliminating the Causes of War. Queens College. Cambridge. UK. Available at: <http://www.pugwash.org/reports/pac256/WG4draft.1.htm>. Accessed on 5 May 2009.

Nikitin. A. 2000. Draft Background Paper for Working Group 2: Political and Economic Consequences of War. 50th Pugwash Conference on Science and World Affairs: Eliminating the

Causes of War. Queens College. Cambridge. UK. Available at:

<http://www.pugwash.org/reports/pac256/WG2draft1.htm>. Accessed on 5 May 2009.

North. D. 20 March 2010. “The Crisis of American Capitalism”. World Socialist Web Site.

International Committee of the Fourth International (ICFI). Available at:

<http://www.wsws.org/articles/2005/jan2005/nb-j17.shtml>. Accessed on 20 February 2011.

Paul. J. August 2002 (a). “Iraq: The Struggle For Oil”. Global Policy Forum. New York.

Available at: <http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/oil/2002/08jim.htm>. Accessed on 15 June 2004.

Paul. J. December 2002 (b). “Oil in Iraq: The Heart of the Crisis”. Global Policy Forum. New

York. Available at: <http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/oil/2002/12heart.htm>. Accessed on 15 June 2004.

Paul. J. 28 January 2004. “Iraq Oil Bonanza: Estimating Future Profits”. Global Policy Forum.

New York. Available at: <http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/oil/2004/0128oilprofit.htm>.

Accessed on 13 August 2006.

Plitnick. M. 14 May 2003. “Who Controls US Foreign Policy?”. ZNET. Available at:

<http://www.zcommunications.org/who-controls-us-foreign-policy-by-mitchell-plitnick>. Accessed on 15 June 2004.

Qumsiyeh. M. 9 August 2007. “Connecting the Dots: Iraq and Palestine: The Israeli Lobby and

the Iraq War”. IfAmericansKnew.Org. El Cerrito. CA. Available at:

http://www.ifamericansknew.org/us_ints/iraq-pal-israel.html. Accessed on 11 April 2001.

Renner. M. 14 February 2003. “The New Oil Order: Washington’s War on Iraq is the Lynchpin

to Controlling Persian Gulf Oil”. Foreign Policy in Focus. World Watch Institute. US. Available

at: http://www.agitprop.org.au/mowar/20030214_renner_the_new_oil_order.php. Accessed on

15 June 2005.

Scott. P. D. 27 May 2003. “Bush’s Deep Reasons for the War on Iraq: Oil, Petrodollars and the OPEC Euro Question”. Available at: <http://www.peterdalescott.net/iraq.html>. Accessed on 15 June 2005.

Sadrudin. M. 5 November 2006. “The Invasion of Iraq: The Hidden Story”. Chowk.Com. Available at: <http://www.chowk.com/interacts/11343/2/0/0>. Accessed on 9 November 2010.

Watson. H. & Boag. J. 2000. Draft Background Paper for Working Group 3: Ethnicity and Religion. 50th Pugwash Conference on Science and World Affairs: Eliminating the Causes of War. Queens College. Cambridge. UK. Available at: <http://www.pugwash.org/reports/pac/pac256/WG3draft.1.htm>. Accessed on 5 May 2009.

Zunes. S. August 2002. “Seven Reasons to Oppose a U.S. Invasion of Iraq”. Focus Policy Report. International Relations. Creative Commons Attribution Inc. Washington DC. Available at: http://www.fpiif.org/papers/iraq2_body.html. Accessed on 20 March 2007.

Zunes. S. 20 October 2004. “The U.S. Invasion of Iraq: The Military Side of Globalisation”. Common Dreams org. News Centre. Available at: <http://www.commondreams.org/views04/1020-28.htm>. Accessed on 14 February 2008.

Zunes. S. 4 January 2006. “The U.S. Invasion of Iraq: Not the Fault of Israel and its Supporters”. Foreign Policy in Focus. International Relations Centre. Available at: <http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=23101&Cr=iraq&Cr1=>. Accessed on 14 February 2008.

ANNEX I

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

American-Israeli Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC)
Billion Barrels (bbl)
Central Intelligence Agency (CIA)
Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA)
Department of Defense (DoD)
Department of Energy (DoE)
Energy Information Administration (EIA)
European Union (EU)
Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU)
International Energy Agency (IEA)
International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)
International Monetary Fund (IMF)
Iraq Survey Group (ISG)
Middle East and North Africa (MENA)
Million Barrels Per Day (mbd)
Missan Oil Company (MOC)
National Intelligence Estimate (NIE)
National Security Presidential Directive (NSPD)
North Oil Company (NOC)
Oil for Food Programme (OFF)
Office of Special Plans (OSP)
Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC)
Project for the New American Century (PNAC)
South Oil Company (SOC)
Trillion Cubic Feet (Tcf)
United Arab Emirates (UAE)
United Kingdom (UK)
United Nations (UN)

United Nations General Assembly (UNGA)

United Nations Monitoring, Inspection and Verification Commission (UNMOVIC)

United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM)

United Nations Security Council (UNSC)

United States (US)

United States Agency for International Development (USAID)

Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD)

World Bank (WB)